PRISM

AN ANGLICAN MONTHLY

MAY, 1961 Vol. V No. 5

HOTCH POTCH

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

Is. 6d.

PRISM
32 BLOOMSBURY STREET
LONDON, W.C.1
Telephone: MUSeum 3855

Editor:
TIMOTHY BEAUMONT
Editorial Advisory Committee:
DONALD ALLCHIN
ROBIN DENNISTON
CHRISTOPHER MARTIN
ROBIN MINNEY
NICHOLAS MOSLEY

Subscription rates (*post free*):

3 months, 5s.
6 months, 10s.
12 months, 20s.

Prism can be obtained at Church bookshops

THIS MONTH

		Page
REVISING THE LITURGY	H. A. L. Rice	1
A PLAN FOR 1962	Peter Oakley	6
CATHEDRALS	Brian Williams	13
THOUGHTS BEFORE DR. RAMSEY'S ENTHRONEMENT	David L. Edwards	19
SACRIFICES TOWARDS REUNION	John Fletcher	23
NOT QUITE ECUMENICAL	J. T. A. Gunstone	26
SALVATION	John Woodgate	29
SERVICE OVERSEAS	Georgina Battiscombe	33
RED HERRINGS AND SOFT ANSWERS	Valerie Pitt	35
MADE FOR MAN	Raymond Chapman	39
LETTER FROM KOREA	Roger Tennant	41
STEWARDS HERETICAL	J. M. Bickersteth	43
LETTERS		47
THE MELCHESTER TRADITION	Ronald Diss	51
COMMENT		52
ON A TRANSKEIAN ROAD	Miranda Stuart	53
ON OBEDIENCE AND REBELLION—II	John Wilkinson	55

Revising the Liturgy

H. A. L. Rice

It is fairly widely agreed nowadays that the Holy Communion was not intended by our Lord, by the Church Universal, nor by the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer, to become a sort of pious "extra" for the super-devout—for those, as it were, taking "honours" in religion. It was intended to be the normal family act of worship for Christians of all degrees of proficiency—the service at which the faithful members of the Christian community in any given place (or, at any rate, the majority of them; dependent, of course, upon the circumstances of their lives and work) would be expected to meet together, Sunday by Sunday, to worship, to offer their sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, to hear God's Word read and expounded, to break bread and receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and to show the Lord's death till he come. Here is the whole quintessence of Christian fellowship in both its Godward and manward aspects—worship, praise, penitence, thanks, instruction, intercession, sacrifice, communion—"the Lord's own Service on the Lord's own Day;" God's family, in God's house, around God's board, praising Christ on mystic rood and reaching forth to take God's holy Food.

All this is fairly common ground and it is the basis of the Liturgical Movement in its Anglican, Roman and Protestant apparitions in this country and on the Continent. So far as the Prayer Book services are concerned, certain consequences arise from the acceptance of these basic principles. It is impossible to maintain any longer that Holy Communion at eight, Mattins at eleven and Evensong at six-thirty is a satisfactory arrangement liturgically or scripturally—these two criteria really being one and the same. Nor can it be claimed that a "Low Mass" with communion before breakfast and a "High" or Sung Mass later in the morning with no communicants is any nearer to the ideal. Not one of these services possesses all of the essential concomitants. "Early celebrations" offer no instruction in the faith, despite the Prayer Book requirement that a sermon should follow the Creed. Nor do they normally present a very inspiring spectacle of a worshipping community. This can only normally be achieved by singing together, and anything less com-

munal and joyfully fraternal than a typically Anglican eight o'clock service, with its usually fairly sparse congregation scattered aloofly about the church, spending most of the service on its knees and muttering darkly its customary portions of the rite, it must surely be hard to conceive. "High Mattins", with its severely formal and monastically intellectual approach, makes no provision for the family, sacramental sharing of the Living Bread; nor, for that matter, does the *Missa Cantata* or High Mass without communicants. Worship divorced from communion is an anomaly.

Clearly, then, what has in this country come to be termed, for want of a better name, "the Parish Communion"—sung with simple but dignified ceremonial, a "liturgical sermon" preached at the point where the Prayer Book rubric orders it, and most if not all of those present who are confirmed receiving the Blessed Sacrament—this is increasingly and rightly coming to be regarded as the ideal principal Sunday morning service in Anglican parish churches.

The ideas which underlie the "Parish Communion" are steadily gaining ground and not only in our own Communion. The Roman Church, particularly in France, Belgium and Germany, is moving in many respects towards the same viewpoint, and so are some of the Protestant bodies, though here again the Continentals appear to be in advance of our more conservative home-grown Non-conformists. Yet, even amongst those of the Anglican clergy who most wholeheartedly support these ideas, there is a certain measure of disquiet and misgiving concerning some aspects of the matter.

For example, while they would all probably agree that Mattins should be regarded as a subsidiary service and that it should be treated as an introduction to the Eucharist, many feel that in abandoning Mattins altogether they would be depriving their flocks of certain important elements of Christian worship, notably the Psalms, Canticles and Old Testament lessons. In modern conditions it would be futile to expect more than a handful of the devout to attend Mattins *and* Eucharist as a regular thing, and comparatively few of those who attend church in the morning seem to attend Evensong as well, except on rare occasions. Our Evensong congregations, largely non-communicant, and non-sacramental in their worship, constitute a separate problem of their own, though we have not yet reached the position of our fellow-Anglicans in the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A., where it would seem that evening congregations have virtually ceased to exist. How, then, can we

reconcile the Parish Communion ideal with a desire to conserve for our people the most liturgically valuable elements of Prayer Book Mattins?

If we are not to perpetuate the division of our people into what are at present two separate water-tight Sunday morning congregations, the aim must surely be to conflate the two services now competing for the attention and attendance of our people. The Anglican Liturgy of the future ought to be a synthesis of Mattins and Eucharist with the instructional and hortatory parts of the service leading on to the intercessory, laudatory, sacrificial and sacramental parts. If such a synthesis can be arrived at, a two-fold object will have been achieved—an Anglican Liturgy of unimpeachable Catholic integrity and a great leap forward towards that internal Anglican unity which to some of us seems an essential pre-requisite for any wider moves in the ecumenical direction.

It must, of course, be left to the liturgiologists to thrash out the details of the coming great Anglican Liturgy, but those of us who are deeply concerned over this problem may surely without impropriety fly our own experimental liturgical kites—not to be used without lawful authority, but as bases for discussion, criticism and consideration.

Firstly, it is obvious that if two already full-length services are to be conflated into one which the average Anglican church-goer is not to look upon as too great a tax upon his devotional staying-powers, certain things must be left out which many would prefer to see retained. This would be inevitable, and if the principle of conflation were conceded the main debate might be expected to centre around this particular point.

Secondly, since ceremonial practices vary so greatly from parish to parish, those parts of the new service which implied such practices as are not universal—the Offertory procession and presentation of the Elements, for example—might well be printed in parentheses and regarded as optional.

And, since a would-be innovator should be prepared at least to present his proposals for public appraisal and dissection, herewith is a general outline of what the present writer has in mind for an Anglican Liturgy of the future.

(Our Father.) Collect for Purity.

Versicles and Responses (as at Mattins).

Venite and/or Psalm.

Old Testament Lesson.
Te Deum, *Benedictus*, or *Benedicite* (according to season).
Nine-fold Kyrie.
Collect for the Day.
Epistle.
Short Gradual Psalm (or verses of a Psalm).
Gospel.
Sermon.
Creed.
Offertory (Hymn).
Prayer for the Church, preferably in Litany form.
Sursam Corda.
Preface. Sanctus.
The Eucharistic Prayer with the Memorial of our Redemption (Anamnesis) and Prayer of Oblation.
The Lord's Prayer.
Agnus Dei.
Short Confession and Absolution (as in Compline).
Prayer of Humble Access.
The Communion (Hymn).
Prayer of Thanksgiving (said by all together).
Gloria in Excelsis. (Except in Advent and Lent.)
The Blessing.
(Hymn.)

* * *

Those who have habitually attended Mattins would be asked to sacrifice little beyond the verbose Introductory matter which Cranmer largely borrowed from Continental sources, and those accustomed to a Sung Eucharist would gain much to compensate them for the loss of the *Benedictus Qui Venit*, an odd hymn or two, and the now obsolescent "Last Gospel".

If it be objected that such a service might prove to be lengthy, might we not all reconsider whether a bare hour on a Sunday morning is really all we are prepared to devote to what after all is man's

highest form of activity here or hereafter—the worship of the all-holy God? Just as Christian Stewardship has compelled us to re-think our whole attitude to the giving of *money* to God's purposes and glory, so may not Christian Liturgical Renewal lead us to an entirely fresh and more generous assessment of the amount of *time* we are prepared to offer to God?

There are, as it is, many who gladly devote far more than the conventional hour to worship on a Sunday morning; many who attend a service at eight o'clock and another at eleven or thereabouts. An hour-and-a-half at one go, so to speak, is not a superhuman achievement and set beside the time spent by our Orthodox brethren in worship appears almost parsimonious. Unconfirmed children might perhaps be dismissed before the sermon if this should be thought desirable and no one, surely, would look askance at the housewife or hospital nurse who came in late or slipped out before the end. Worship without some small personal sacrifice would be a poor thing with which to come before the altar of God.

K. S. LATOURETTE

CHRISTIANITY IN A REVOLUTIONARY AGE: III
THE NINETEENTH CENTURY OUTSIDE EUROPE

This new volume of Professor Latourette's continues his encyclopaedic history of Christianity since the French Revolution. Volume I covers The Nineteenth Century in Europe (Background and the Roman Catholic Phase), Volume II The Nineteenth Century in Europe (The Protestant and Eastern Churches).

63s. each

EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE

A Plan for 1962

PETER OAKLEY

At the moment there are few members of the Church of Englan who are able or willing to engage in the process of the radic revision of the Prayer Book. This is recognised by authorities o the subject. The Dean of Bristol has made it clear that the way fo ward in liturgical revision "means a process of education such a we have not yet even envisaged". The first Report of the Liturgica Commission, "Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England" and the Lambeth Conference Committee on "The Book of Commo Prayer" both counselled extreme caution in the speed and scop of liturgical revision. The question remains, "How can the Churc be prepared for liturgical change?" In 1962 we shall keep th tercentenary of The Book of Common Prayer. This gives us a grea opportunity to engage in the liturgical education of the church.

i. *It is proposed that* 1962 *be kept as a Liturgical Year*, using th third centenary of the 1662 Prayer Book as a focus for its activities We are able to arouse considerable enthusiasm for the "Anglica Communion" during Lambeth Conference year; with prope organisation it should be possible to do something of the same kin to arouse interest in Christian Worship.

ii. *In order to organise the Liturgical Year and to continue in th future the work of liturgical study and renewal, it is suggested tha a permanent Liturgical Secretariat or Institute be set up.* This woul be an official centre of liturgical research, experiment and publicity It would work in close liaison with the Liturgical Commission an with churches of the Anglican Communion, keeping well informe of developments in the Roman Church and other churches. Th Liturgical and Pastoral Institutes of the Roman Church on th Continent should be fruitful sources from which to gain experienc for our Anglican venture. For some time now the Extra-Mura Department of Birmingham University, under the direction o Gilbert Cope, has been organising schools and courses on liturg and the liturgical movement. Organisations like "Parish and People and the Church Union would be in a position to assist with thei

experience of work in the field of liturgy. There are other voluntary bodies that could give advice when necessary. The success of a Liturgical Institute would depend on the nature of the Director and his staff, the degree of independence allowed to him and a true balance of academic and pastoral interest in its work.

iii. *The Liturgical Secretariat or Institute, in co-operation with the official Board of Education and the voluntary educational societies of the Church, such as S.P.C.K., would be asked to prepare suitable literature and teaching aids for use during the year.* There is a great deal of suitable material already available but book lists, digests and prepared study outlines—especially if they had something of the flavour of Harold Wilson's "Reading the Bible Together" about them would be of value. For those who get caught up in an enthusiasm for it, liturgy is a fascinating and intriguing subject. The glories of past ways of worship and the detective-like qualities needed by the student of ancient rites are things that could be communicated easily to many more people in the church. Christians need a sense of history to free them from the shackles of their present limited experience of man's approach to God in worship.

iv. *In every diocese a small working committee should be set up to further the aims of the Liturgical Year.* This could be a sub-committee of the Diocesan Education Committee, an arrangement which might ease certain financial and constitutional difficulties. (It has already been suggested by a Midlands archdeacon that every diocese should have its own Liturgical Commission. It certainly seems, apart from these proposals, that every Bishop needs to have some group of liturgical experts to whom he can turn.)

The Diocesan Committee would be the agent of the Liturgical Institute at Diocesan level. It would be responsible for the provision of men and materials, in the diocese, to make possible a year of liturgical study. In the St. Albans Diocese there is a Mobile Missionary Unit that presents changing programmes on missionary subjects through the use of film strip and tape recording. A liturgical mobile unit on similar lines would not be impossible. The committee, in co-operation with rural deaneries and parishes would seek to organise liturgical weeks, week-ends, parish meetings and study courses. A demonstration could be trained to show how revisions have been made in Eucharistic and Baptismal Rites in other churches of the Anglican Communion, the rite of C.S.I., the Experimental Rite from Birmingham, and the new proposed services for Baptism and Con-

firmation. There is also much scope in past liturgies for demonstration.

The Bishop might be given permission for the use of other Anglican Eucharistic Rites to be used during the year, in order to show the nature of the revisions on 1662 that have been made. Exhibitions on the allied subject of church art and architecture could be arranged. At the major Diocesan events, where the Bishop is in liturgical authority in his own cathedral, there might be variations on the normal liturgical practices, for example, concelebration at ordinations, concelebration of the Bishop and senior priests at Diocesan Festivals with the use of the basilican position. There is no reason why these usages should not be seen in the parishes and at clergy gatherings.

iv. *The clergy, under the Bishop, might use the Liturgical Year to consider in Synod, or at a number of visitation centres, the problem of their own theological and liturgical integrity.* Many clergy, on the grounds of personal preference or of an unquestioned tradition of doutbful origin use variations from the 1662 Prayer Book. It would be difficult to justify some of these practices. One or two examples of the kind of problems that come to mind are these. Is the ceremonial of High Mass as it has come down to us from the Middle Ages really the most effective vehicle for the solemn corporate offering of the Body of Christ? (This is based on a comment of Fr. Humphrey Green on the last Anglo-Catholic Congress.) In view of the considerable criticism that can be levelled against the Interim Rite or the interpolation of the Roman Canon into the Prayer Book Service of Holy Communion, have such practices any justification? (For the details of the case against these practices see E. L. Mascall, "The Recovery of Unity", pages 139-140. A Couratin, "Liturgiology 1939-1960", an article in Theology, November 1960.) Why does the Holy Communion still remain the submerged service in many low, evangelical and broad churches, despite the biblical evidences for its primacy? Why is the service a clerical monopoly? There is a good deal of evidence to support the view that those who ought to be experts in the practice and teaching of Christian worship are technically ignorant and continue to teach and to do things that cannot be theologically justified. Too often theologically considerations are suspect among the parish clergy. The slogan is that "We are all practical men here", but the question remains, "What is the justification for our practice?" Leaders owe it to those

that they lead to be honest. Many recently trained priests are asked in their first curacies to accept and use rites and ceremonies that they know cannot be defended on the grounds of good scholarship or of any authority. They do what they are told because the *jus liturgicum* is exercised by their rector or vicar. Their integrity is trespassed against in the name of parochial practice. The tragedy of this is that their enthusiasm and zeal for some of the truths that have been revealed by the Holy Spirit through the liturgical movement are deadened down. We must never allow the children of today so to influence the thought and behaviour of today as to make us out of date tomorrow but greater care could be taken to ensure that enthusiasm and scholarship, which can go hand in hand, are not put down with verbal blunt instruments. The enthusiasm of many young priest is frustrated, to the subsequent disadvantage of the whole church.

In the Liturgical year, the ministers of God would do well to make a bold and unprejudiced attempt to solve some of the practical problems that abound in the field of liturgy. It would be worthwhile to work on the problem of the liturgical observance of Holy Week, or the dwindling numbers at the daily Eucharist, and office Groups of neighbouring clergy or those of like schools of churchmanship —for unfortunately they still meet on such a basis—might agree to rationalise their liturgical practice for a given period and then to compare their experience. There might be much to gain from a general return to the Eucharistic Rite of 1662, retaining ceremonial differences on an orderly basis, in order to be in a position to make a proper evaluation of the situation out of which we have to make revision. When all the criticism has been made, the 1662 Communion Order has a certain internal logic that is strikingly absent from the many forms of service that abound in use today.

vi. This last point brings us to the final proposal. *Every parish would be asked during the Liturgical Year to improve the quality of its worship.* It is not often that one can discover a church which truly knows how to offer public worship. Many worshippers still apply the techniques of private devotion to the public corporate worship of the priestly people of God. In many cases they have never been given any instruction in the art of public worship. The inaudibility of the minister and the total lack of prayerful conviction on the part of priests and people at worship is a continuing problem —despite its wide recognition as such. In some churches the objective

nature is entirely absent; the full significance of rite and ceremon is lost because of the problems of sight and sound. A good deal o ceremonial is fussy and lacks purpose, certain actions in the Eucharis are explained on the basis of a doubtful tradition but they no longe have any real function and are not properly part of the worship o the Church of England. If the Liturgical Year did no more tha improve the quality of worship throughout the Church and gave t churchpeople a deeper understanding of current practices it woul have done much.

The basic question before the Church is whether Liturgica Revision is a luxury to be indulged in by the few, the "precious" few or whether it is a necessity for the continuing evangelistic an pastoral work of the Church and for the worship of God with wel founded decency and order?

There is no good reason for launching on a great campaign o liturgical education and dialogue within the Church unless we ar convinced that it is a duty and a necessity. If we are truly wedde to the pursuit of all truth and are seeking to make our worship o God a real and living worship then there seems to be one answe to the question. We must pursue a conscious policy of liturgica education because it is necessary for the very life of the Church It would be fatal to urge a venture of this kind upon an unwillin and unco-operative church. And yet, present conservatism an ignorance will continue in respect of the liturgy so long as peopl have no idea as to the nature and reason for changes in the establishe services. A start has to be made somewhere. The reception of th recent proposals for new forms of service for "Baptism and Confirma tion" by some top people in the Church has given the impressio that they were a little amazed at the radical nature of what wa produced. There may even be a secret movement to ensure that suc radicalism in liturgy does not get a chance to "catch on" in th Church!

The year 1962 could be a memorable one in the Church of England not just because she is under new management, but because there was a common effort, transcending party lines, which gave to th Church a new humility as a learning Church, dedicated to the exam ination of her current ways of worship and seeking from the treasure of the past and from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the presen to bring forth something new for tomorrow.

TO ALL NEW READERS OF PRISM

Last month many of you received your first copy of PRISM as the result of a free offer we made to our regular readers.

This month we are sending one extra copy of PRISM to each of our regular subscribers for passing on to their friends.

This will mean that many new readers will wish to become regular subscribers, and in order to make sure of your monthly copy of PRISM, please complete the form below and return it together with your subscription to:

"PRISM"

32 BLOOMSBURY STREET,

LONDON, W.C.1.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

I wish to take out a subscription for PRISM for 12 months (£1)—6 months (10/-)—3 months (5/-), post free, and enclose £.....:.....s.

TIME AND TIDE

ON SALE NOW. Order from your bookshop or newsagent, copies of the Special Church Number of T. & T.

The first annual review of the Anglican and other Churches in England includes articles on:

The Church in Wales by the Bishop of Llandaff.
The Church in Scotland by Giles Wordsworth.
The Church of Ireland by Coslett Quinn.
The Free Churches by Dr. A. R. Vine.
The Roman Church by Norman St. John Stevas.

There is much more than this. Valerie Pitt reviews The New Bible, Michael Wall considers Canterbury's travels. Peter Whiteley ponders The Government of the Church, and G. W. Lampe writes on the Ordination of Women. Don't forget to read the State of the Church of England, for here is food for more thought.

SPECIAL CHURCH EDITION of APRIL 27

TIME AND TIDE

On Sale now at all leading newsagents

Cathedrals

Brian Williams

In December's Prism, James Portman called attention, with some acerbity, to the state of Westminster Abbey and its way of life. While I would not question the appropriateness of many of his criticisms and questions raised about the Abbey, nor the truth of the assertion that drastic surgery is needed by the patient, it seems to me that neither the article nor the letters which it provoked raised the more important issue, of which the Abbey is only one, and in many ways an excusably eccentric manifestation. This issue is that of our cathedrals: what are they, and what have we, as a church, the right to demand that they should be?

The situation at present is perfectly clear. We have inherited (a favourite word in cathedral circles) buildings and accessories on a grand scale from the period when Christianity was at its most influential (and most distorted) point in this country. The conception of the cathedral as the great mother church of the diocese which this period evolved, and the exact pattern of matriarchy which this mother-figure in wood and stone is to follow, has been established beyond any questions of function and usage; the cathedrals exist in their own right. Together with the buildings we have "inherited" a peculiar form of life, and rhythm of religious behaviour, rooted and grounded in the middle ages and conditioned only to a minimal degree by the demands of "Anglican Piety"—that useful, if intangible, and evidently seventeenth-century, entity. So powerful has the influence of this established pattern become in the dioceses of England and Wales that even those new sees which did not originally possess a great mediaeval monument were zealous to see that everything possible was done—if necessary at great expense—to create one, and it would seem that even Coventry, despite the comparative modernity of its idiom, has accepted the pattern of life as essentially valid. And the pattern is this. The daily round of the Anglican services, coloured from time to time by judicious borrowings from mediaeval versions of the Latin rite, is performed by a group of learned, amiable and usually elderly clergymen, for whom the wild world has become, or always has been, too strenuous. The more exacting vocal parts of their ministry are performed vicariously

by a small mercenary choir, for which communicant membership of the church is rarely a stipulated condition of membership. From time to time the cathedral also becomes a centre for some civic or pan-ecclesiastical function which limitations of space or other considerations force upon it. Little else happens to alter the even tenour of the cathedral's ways, and if it does, it is not usually welcomed. Thousands of tourists and visitors come into contact with this situation every year; they accept it as the normal pattern of life which a cathedral should live, and many of them might be more than startled to find anything different. The pattern very rarely comes in for any criticism from church people, other than in the misguided complaint that Cathedral Services are "high-church", and the universal wail against the inadequacy of their heating arrangements.

This, then, is the pattern: what is its normal justification? We are told, by clerical guides, or by those elaborate little booklets about the life or soul of a cathedral, that a cathedral exists "to carry on services of worship to God in the finest and noblest form possible, with the best music and ceremonial . . ." (*Salisbury Cathedral, its purpose: its staff and finances*, by A. F. Smethurst, 1952). There are many variants to this theme, and they will be found in almost every cathedral in the land. The corollaries are that for the purposes of a cathedral, professional competence and artistic merit are of greater importance than congregational involvement, and that congregations, if any, must be prepared to worship through the agency of those whose duty it is to maintain this high standard of aesthetic worship which is the "Cathedral Tradition". Before even we question this very peculiar concept from the standpoint of a theology of the Church and the liturgy, let us pause for one moment to make a primary assertion which will be of some importance later.

The function and role of a cathedral is no such thing as has been suggested in the quotation above; nor is it any of the secondary usages which are so regularly added to the principle of the offering of "the best" in worship. The function of the cathedral church is to be the setting for and the home of the Bishop's liturgy. The only *raison d'etre* which a cathedral has is the possession of a Bishop's throne, and the only essential purpose it serves for the Church is to be the focal point of diocesan unity behind and in the Bishop. If it is not doing this then I would suggest that it is not serving

the catholic church in catholic fashion, and if we are honest, the majority of our cathedral churches in this country, where the bishop is a suspected visitor in his own church, and where deans and chapters jealously guard their mediaeval privileges won at the cost of the unity of the diocese from bishops who were feudal lords first, and fathers second, are most certainly not witnessing to this very important principle.

If this primary assertion is accepted, together with the corollary that the normative celebrant at the cathedral eucharist is the bishop, and the pattern of its life should be a reflection of the bishop's prayers, it will be obvious that the question of the objective offering of worship in a regular round is in any case something of a red-herring. But to be fair, it has become so ingrained in Anglican thinking that there is going to be no redemption of cathedrals from their present mortuary condition unless it is taken into account, and so perhaps one may be permitted briefly to comment upon it. The theory appears to rest upon two main assumptions, about the nature of prayer and the life of the Church:

(*a*) That there is no necessary *organic* connection between worship and the community—the connection suggested by the theory quoted above being merely a formal one by which the living church sanctions a pattern of worship, and then employs a group of men and boys to carry out what it has sanctioned professionally.

(*b*) That there is in any case an objective standard of worship—or indeed that there is such a thing as "objective worship".

I would suggest, with caution, that the first of these assumptions is theologically wrong, and that the second of them is at least so debatable as to have no real hope of justification in this life! The liturgical movement has been teaching very hard, over the last ten years or so, that worship is not merely an external form in which the faithful acquiesce with varying degrees of passivity, but a living growth from the life of the Body of Christ; the true vehicle for that seeking of the kingdom of God which is the imperative all christians must obey. What seems to have been gravely misunderstood in our cathedral tradition is that in the monastic communities from which "cathedral worship" emanated, this was exactly the case; the elaborate structure of offices and Mass, the intricate and inexhaustible variation of theme and development derived from a common life in which the strain of worship was indeed the main activity of the

day, and the one which more than any other bound the monks into a community, part of the body of Christ effecting a local realisation of its true nature. To that worship, with its common denominators of modal chanting and eclectic but accepted ceremonial, every single member of the monastic community could contribute, and it was a vital part of their ministry that they should do so.

The fact that our cathedrals are no longer the worshipping centres of communities in any real sense; that the monastic communities which set the original pattern have disappeared through the late-mediaeval secularisation and the reformation reorganisation of the cathedral pattern has been completely ignored from the outset, and an attempt has been made to form a compromise which, however aesthetically pleasing it may occasionally be, simply does not bear any recognisable relation to the life of the Body of Christ at large; it would appear to be a professional mystery-cult performed on behalf of the many by the few, and this is a long way from the liturgical life which we have been learning to live; it is indeed the very thing from which we have been trying to escape.

It is noticeable that nowhere has the liturgical movement and the accompanying intensifying and clarifying of public worship made less impression than in the cathedrals. This is deplorable in itself, for they should be the churches which set the pattern for others to follow instead of being the ditch-dying defenders of the *ancien regime*, yet one hears that one chapter is at this moment busily restoring to its place a beautiful mediaeval choir-screen, which will render a congregational eucharist finally impossible, while others cling grimly to, and delve more and more deeply into their, fourteenth-century missals and breviaries for the performance of their liturgies, to the bewilderment of all but the initiated few.

And what of the second assumption, that because God must have the best which we can offer, a standard (often quite arbitrary) must be set up which demands professional performance and considerable musical skill in its accomplishment. The evangelical would argue, and has argued in the past, that when we talk of "the best" in human endeavour, we are speaking of a moral quality or a spiritual one, so that the religious offering of the best in worship is in fact not that which is aesthetically perfect but that which is given with the whole heart and mind and soul, whatever it be. Now in case it should be said that this is simple-minded philistinism, let us remember that the revolt against the cult of "ars gratia artis"

had a deeply religious origin in the reformation, and sprang from a dawning awareness of that death through prolixity of symbolism and imagery which Huizinga describes so brilliantly in *The Waning of the Middle Ages*; when things used in church have lost their original and radical function, have ceased to speak directly the mind of the worshipping body, and have come to be regarded as an end in themselves, then the time has come for a vigorous pruning, and I would suggest that the time has come, and is indeed long overdue, for this in the English cathedral system.

It may be said that this is merely tilting at yet another windmill, but I would deny this most strongly. The influence of the cathedrals has been, up until the last ten years, very strong indeed in the shaping of parochial worship, and we can see all too clearly the disastrous results of the attempt to ape their eclectic and precious modes of worship in parishes which possess neither the resources nor the ability to achieve the standard demanded. This is a great and unfortunate millstone around our necks, as a church, and we should not lose sight of the need for reform because cathedrals claim a certain *droit-de-seigneur*. They need to be very forcibly ousted from their position, for as well as having a proper role to play in the religious life of their dioceses, they are also the churches which see the greatest variety of casual visitors, many of them from the pagan world far remote from our faith, and as James Portman rightly implied, they should be "charged with the glory of God" so that there can be no mistake about what they stand for and what they enshrine—a living faith not a dead cult.

How? you will ask. At the risk of being shot down as an impractical idealist, I will put forward the following tentative suggestions, none of which will ever be adopted. They are intended to provoke comment, rather than to be a definitive manifesto.

(a) Restore the cathedral to the bishop as his own church, and instead of the vested interest of Dean and Chapter, appoint a number of priests all of equal status, together with a deacon or two, as the bishop's personal staff for maintaining the pastoral and administrative running of the church itself.

(b) Abolish vergers, and professional choirs.

(c) Combine all the parishes within easy reach of the cathedral into one main city parish, staffed from among the cathedral staff, each of whom should have special responsibility for one part of the town, so that the cathedral once again becomes the bishop's

paroikia, as it should always have been, and the bishop himself is father to a particular flock as well as to the diocese at large.

(d) Form communities of lay people who have work in the town around the cathedral closes, who are bound to a simple rule of life, such as the singing or, preferably, recitation of the daily two offices and the assistance at the daily Eucharist. Thus the valuable ideal of a praying community could be combined with a high degree of involvement in the local society, and the image of Barchester society would disappear, to our lasting good.

(e) Maintain a daily round of short intercessory services in the cathedral by its permanent staff, with prayers said at regular intervals for the conversion of the world and especially of this country, for the unity of the churches of God, for the sick, suffering and departed, and for the political and social life of the world and the nation. No-one should be able to come into a cathedral which was used in this way and remain long unaware of what its first work was, and what its main purpose.

(f) Evacuate ruthlessly all guide-books, postcards, small notices in Gothic script and other acquiescences in the suggestion that the cathedral is a museum. Lights and ikons and boldly printed prayers to be read before the shrines of saints and the altars of side chapels (if the latter are to be retained) would also be a help, and Reservation at a focal point would be invaluable. Let us above all, get rid of fractions of the cathedral "reserved for private prayer".

(g) Associate closely information offices and pastoral counselling rooms with the cathedral, and maintain a "day and night service" in these latter, so that there can never be the claim that the cathedral is not interested pastorally in its visitors. Old choir vestries and morgue-like transepts might well be converted for this purpose! The Americans have much to teach us in these matters, and there is no room for the snobbery which despises such methods in a church which has 85 per cent of the population to convert.

These suggestions in themselves will not, I know, serve to produce a revolution in cathedral thinking. I have lived for long enough in a place where a cathedral is actually performing a parochial ministry to realise the great possibilities of the situation; long enough in the shadow of other cathedrals to realise how unlikely it is that they will ever move towards any of these reforms. But if they provoke even a little thought and response, they will have done all that they were meant to do.

Thoughts Before Dr. Ramsey's Enthronement

David L. Edwards

(This article reacts to Robin Denniston's "The Hundredth Archbishop of Canterbury" (Prism for February 1961). The article resulted from an interview with Dr. Ramsey shortly before the announcement of his translation to Canterbury. I have adopted the interview technique, but this interview is between the two halves of the split personality which constitutes me as I react to Mr. Denniston's piece. The two halves are D for Devotee and E for Ecumeniac.—D.L.E.)

D: A scoop, what?

E: But what was Denniston *doing* at Bishopthorpe, with "some business to discuss"? Sinister!

D: Don't be jealous. It was a serious article about a serious man. Look at this sentence for example: "The life of the spirit and the affairs of the spirit have, for him, a primacy over what one may label the theology of 'the Church-*is*-mission'." Isn't that in the great tradition?

E: Yes, as long as the life of the spirit isn't interpreted as retreating for ever into a private world echoing with the past but not with the 20th century. Jesus would not have been Jesus without the thirty years in Nazareth—but he left his retreat for the rough and tumble, and if he hadn't he wouldn't have been the Saviour of the World.

D: *Of course* we all know that worship must lead into work. But the Archbishop's no escapist. He brings the life of the spirit into active church life. Because he has the background he has, he's able to see more deeply, more clearly, into the real issues.

E: It's perfectly true that too many of those who work for the reform of the Church get themselves too involved with *things*. Many of them are by temperament intellectuals or administrators, and a good few are in office jobs. They are tempted to see themselves as rushing about rearranging things. Their own prayer life suffers; they become conceited, touchy and jaded because they

have no time for refreshment of the spirit. And ordinary people don't react, because ordinary people know that the Church isn't *things*. It's God first, and then people. It's something less definable, less manageable, more local, more human, more awkward, more glorious, than the reformers imagine.

D: I'm glad that you've woken up at last to what everyone else has been muttering for years. Why, then, d'you have that "Yes-but" tone in your voice?

E: I'll come clean. You see what the Archbishop is quoted as saying. "Ecumenism—the word I hate most". Can you expect me *not* to have reservations in my welcome?

D: You must admit it's a ghastly word.

E: I admit it *is* ugly. I wish sometimes that this unpronounceable word "ecumenical" could be replaced by the simple "unity movement". But you see how Denniston goes on. "He deplores the man-energised attempts to wring apparent unity out of a theologically disunited situation by negotiation or *formulae verborum*". As a description of the modern ecumenical movement, that's slander. Everyone who's anyone in the movement has denounced that conception of unity a thousand times.

D: I bet the Archbishop never said that. You know how Archbishops of Canterbury are always misquoted. This is Dr. Ramsey's baptism in printer's ink. You see what Denniston adds: "With unity itself he is passionately concerned".

E: There'll be many opportunities for more formal statements, and these, no doubt, will put the position right. We must remember that Dr. Ramsey now becomes one of the key ecumenical leaders himself! But I dread the appearance of a generation of Anglican clergymen who think it's smart to sneer at the ecumnical movement.

D: Now come, who's sneering?

E: Even praying for unity can become a sneer if you think prayer is a substitute for the hard work of getting to know other Christians, thinking hard about their theology and church order, and opening negotiations with them in order to lead up to a visible reunion.

D: Look here! Nineteen sixty-one has seen a vast increase in goodwill. Look at Dr. Fisher's visit to Rome and the East! Were the prospects ever brighter?

E: But remember that there is no prospect of reunion with Rome or

the East. The prospect that *does* exist for the Church of England is of reunion with the English Free Churches. And I'm frightened that Anglicans will now become increasingly hoity-toity towards Nonconformists.

D: Haven't you forgotten that we're negotiating with the Methodists?

E: But everyone knows that such negotiations are doomed to failure unless both sides *want* to be united. Do ordinary Anglicans *want* to be united with ordinary Methodists?

D: I want to be united with everyone.

E: With Methodists? Or Presbyterians?

D: What would be the price?

E: Abandoning the old Anglo-Catholic claim that only sacraments administered after episcopal ordination are valid. That claim is bunkum. Looking back, we see no evidence that Christ or the Apostles entrusted the Church to Bishops as Anglicanism knows Bishops; episcopacy of the modern sort developed later. And looking around we see that Christ is present in non-episcopal Churches; that's validity for me. Such Churches are not fully Catholic—but the episcopal Churches, too, have enormous defects, and I'm beginning to think that the Catholic Church isn't at present fully incarnate anywhere! We must have Bishops—and Bishops standing in the historic succession. But let's not talk nonsense about their being the *sine qua non* of the Church's existence.

D: Dr. Ramsey does *not* talk nonsense.

E: I never said he did—but some of his admirers do.

D: Look at his book *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*. There's Anglo-Catholicism with a new look. It's part of the biblical theology you are always going on about.

E: Yes—but I think there's a danger of identifying the present shape of Anglicanism (e.g. the episcopal system as we know it) with the Catholic Church, and of saying that the Gospel includes the Catholic Church. The implication may be that non-Anglicans, at any rate in England, have failed to understand the Gospel.

D: That's a travesty of the spirit of the book.

E: I only said this was the *danger*. I'm talking about what could happen when Archiepiscopal theology becomes the fashion among people unable to appreciate Archiepiscopal refinements.

D: You must agree that Anglicans in conversation with other Christians have a lot to give.

E: And a lot to receive. The whole of the Anglican Communion is under five per cent of Christendom.

D: You sound as if Ecumenism were greater than Anglicanism.

E: Keep this dark, but I think it is.

D: You can't expect a man to become Archbishop of Canterbury in order to preside over the dissolution of the Church of England.

E: That's exactly what I do expect. I shall regard it as a sign of failure if Dr. Ramsey's successor in the 1980s inherits the same job. It ought to be by then the leadership of a greatly enlarged community.

D: Dr. Ramsey *will* change the job— by making it more academic and spiritual. You see what the interview says: "He sees no need for diocesan bishops to be chairman of the central committees". And, you watch, he'll lead the Church towards freedom from State control. You see what it says: "He would like to see the Church disestablished". He'll be the last Archbishop to be appointed by the Prime Minister.

E: Those are changes for which I sincerely give three cheers. It's going to be an exciting Primacy. But let's not conceal the fact that Free Churchmen are worried lest it should be great only in terms of the little world of Anglicanism. It could be great on the scale of Christendom. It could mark the decisive stage in the emergence of One Church for England. And that would have world-wide consequences.

D: It will be great in that way too, although we must be patient. Nonconformists will show an increasing trust in Dr. Ramsey, never fear. And you must set them an example!

E: I promise. The thing I'm looking forward to most is the Christmas Day sermon in Canterbury Cathedral this year. It'll be almost immediately after the Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Delhi.

D: There you go again. You bore everyone with these constant conferences. He'll probably preach about Christmas.

Sacrifices towards Reunion

JOHN FLETCHER

A few of those who profess to be talking about Reunion in fact seem merely to be advocating that Christians should love one another (which is a good idea, but not the same thing) or that we should resemble one another (which is not necessarily even a good idea). If we are talking about Unity as opposed to Similarity, it might be worth asking what this means, and what sacrifices we must be willing, or may be expected, to make to achieve it. Stephen Willink, in the January number of PRISM, concentrated on inter-denominational understanding and liturgical similarities, and showed how these are growing; but I believe as much good may be done by discussing our differences, by tackling the thorny obstacles in the way of Unity, as by emphasising the existing common ground. I speak as a Roman Catholic, and if I seem much keener to point out the mote in the other fellow's eye than to remove the beam in my own, please forgive me.

Most arguments about the Church of Rome go straight to Papal Infallibility and there die. This has always seemed to me a mistake, like refusing to discuss Christian morality until the fact that Moses received the Ten Commandments from God had been historically proved. All Roman Catholics ought to be able to defend their beliefs without using the argument of Papal Definition, just as he would be a poor fish who believed murder was wrong because, and only because, it was contrary to the Ten Commandments, instead of believing it was contrary to the Ten Commandments because it was wrong. And if Reunion is impossible, I do not believe Papal Infallibility will be the reason, or have anything to do with it. Either the whole movement will come unstuck on a dozen other questions, or it will take the Papacy comfortably in its stride.

Unity, to be worth making sacrifices for, must be a unity of teaching and a unity of discipline. I believe these two are quite different and are usually confused. The Church must teach: She was commanded to do so by her founder. And plainly it's no good, as in the mission fields, teaching in conflict with fellow Christians. She must teach, and her teaching must come from Jesus Christ. She must also have discipline, like any other club; but this comes from Man.

You can force someone to obey a rule with which he disagrees; but you cannot force someone to believe a doctrine with which he disagrees. But the other side of the coin is this: if you are a Christian, you can disagree with the disciplinary rules, though you must still keep them; but the doctrine you cannot disagree with, or you jettison your membership of the Church. The Church of Rome, by using one man to represent both unities, the Bishop of Rome, over whose seal dogmas are defined and the hours of fasting before Communion are proclaimed, has increased the confusion. Plainly infallibility can only apply to the teaching, because while it is tenable (I should say evident) that God prevents the Church from making serious mistakes in her teaching, no such guarantee attaches to the way the Club rules are made and changed. Again, in the Church of Rome, apart from a few small oases of democracy, both the teaching and the discipline appear to be strictly authoritarian; but look more closely, and I shall try to show that the teaching is in fact organic, corporate, in the word of the Church as a whole and no isolated command; and (if it would remove an obstacle to Unity) there is no reason in principle why the Club Rules should not be decided democratically, nor why power to make the rules should not be delegated to local Churches, subject to the final Court of Appeal without which Unity would not exist.

Probably there is little hope for nuclear disarmament unless scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain can meet and discuss and agree; they are the only ones qualified to assess the dangers and cures involved, and their language must be used. So, theologians should prepare themselves to remove what theological misunderstandings there are: the "Filioque" clause in the Nicene Creed, to which is attributed the separation between Eastern and Western Christendom, is I believe a misunderstanding which patience and study could eliminate.

But for their discussions to be fruitful, we must agree on what kind of a Reunited Church we want. Unless we want, and believe we can get, a Church divinely protected from making at least serious mistakes, then I do not see what useful purpose Reunion would serve. For the divergences of belief would remain to shame Christians and confuse non-Christians. We may not like the infallibility of the Pope, we may substitute the infallibility of the Bible, or of Church Councils, or the infallibility of all Bishops, or of all Christians generally. We may have to circumscribe these infallibilities

in some way, and all of them will have to be treated with common sense, not to mention humility and prayer. But let us admit, as we surely can, that if private judgment is to be the ultimate arbiter at the end of the struggle, we are too proud. And those who accept one or other of the infallibilities above, and accept the need for a Church which teaches with Divine authority, protected in some way however vaguely defined from errors of teaching, will in the end I believe see the necessity to accept all of them, and will see that they reinforce each other.

Let me, to my Anglican friends, take two issues to illustrate what Papal Infallibility is and where I doubt whether it is properly understood by the Anglican Communion. The two issues are (deliberately) the most controversial ones between us in this century: on Faith, the Assumption, and on Morals, the problem of contraception. The Assumption has been embodied in the liturgy and beliefs of Christians for (to say the least) a very long time, and in the Orthodox as well as the Roman Churches. The first Archbishop of Canterbury is said to have dedicated a Church to the Assumption. Several Anglican Churches, left over from before the Reformation, are still so dedicated. That belief and devotion has grown up with the Church, and the Pope added nothing to the beliefs of Roman Catholics when he defined it a few years ago. He crystallised, he did not create. Yet one or two Anglican Bishops called it a "new" dogma and generally spoke as if the Pope had invented it the previous night. That this showed ingorance about the Assumption is not at all the point. The point is the ignorance, by implication, about the way the Papacy works. Because it is a very hopeful sign indeed that Papal Infallibility is so misunderstood. Let us hope and pray that we are divided not by real disagreements but by similar ignorance which can be remedied.

In the problem of contraception, it is even more manifest that the teaching of the Roman Church needs no solemn Papal utterance to keep it united, since there is no such utterance. The Bishops, the theologians, have stayed in step without a word of command. Again, Papal infallibility does not exclude or contradict the other infallibilities: they complement each other. (Of course, to change the tone, there are always those who believe the condemnation of contraception to be a clever modern idea, designed by the Irish Bishops to help out-breed the Orangemen. But such people might remember that virtually the whole of Christendom held what is

now rather distortedly regarded as the Roman view; that a meeting of the World Council of Churches showed that the Eastern Orthodox, on this as on the Assumption, share the beliefs of the Pope whose Infallibility they reject; and many non-Christians do too.

On the side of discipline, the sacrifices required may well prove psychologically the greater, and perhaps spiritually the more significant. Let me suggest first that unless Christians are prepared to make any sacrifice at all in their obedience to the Rules of the new Club which we propose to set up, the struggle will be too much. I am personally willing, and I believe most English Roman Catholics would be willing, to adopt the Anglican Service of Holy Communion in place of the Latin Mass, to call Bishops Presbyters, and to allow the Queen to nominate them, if this is only the price of Unity. Would the Church of England be willing to change the Ordination Service to meet the objections of the Papal Bull "Apostolicae Curae", and have her Bishops re-consecrated by Roman, or Orthodox, or Old Catholics? She expected as much, as far as I can see, from the Church of Scotland. It would not mean admitting that Anglican Orders were invalid, but merely that it is less profitable to argue about their validity than to create a situation which admits of no argument.

If Christians are really willing to make such sacrifices, and really willing to submit themselves in matters of Faith and Morality to a United Teaching Church; then I believe no power can prevent Reunion.

Not quite Ecumenical

J. T. A. Gunstone

We really try in our Ministers' Fraternal. We meet each month. We listen with charity. We pray with hope.

Each year during the Unity Octave we used to hold a united service. We flocked to the Baptist chapel to hear an Anglican preach and the following year crowded the parish church for a sermon

by the Baptist. But we felt the service was never truly ecumenical: high Anglicans won't come, Romans can't.

"Let's have a public meeting this year", somebody suggested, "with an Anglican, a Free Church *and* a Roman speaker. Then they'll all come."

Anglicans (i), (ii) and (iii), Baptist (i), Methodist and Congregational agreed it was a good idea. We booked the speakers and the town hall.

At the next Fraternal Baptist (ii), whose church is in the east and respectable part of the town, listened to our plans with a grim expression.

"I wouldn't ask my people to come to a meeting if a Roman's going to speak", he said. "Not after what's happening in Spain".

He turned to Baptist (i).

"Are you going to the meeting?" he asked accusingly.

Baptist (i) flushed. His church is in the west and less respectable.

"Yes", he said uncomfortably.

Baptist (ii) shrugged his shoulders.

"I'm sorry, but you'll have to count me out."

Sadly we continued with the arrangements. Anyway, there were always the Romans.

Roman (i) in the north was keen. He was thrilled with the Archbishop's visit to Rome. He approved of the meeting. He pinned up a notice and urged his people to attend.

Roman (ii) in the south was older and more difficult. He refused to take a notice and wouldn't commit himself. Only his nuns fluttered with excitement.

Back to the Fraternal came Baptist (i) with a long face.

"My people won't join in", he confessed, "not with a Roman".

Anxiously Anglicans (i), (ii) and (iii) looked at each other. Was there anyone else? Of course! Anglican (iv) just over the border.

But Anglican (iv) wouldn't hear of it. Not with a Roman.

"But our Bishop will be in the chair", we protested.

"The Roman's a monk!" he cried in horror.

"But there are Benedictines in the Church of England."

He looked as if he'd heard a blasphemy.

We held the meeting. It was a great success.

Baptists (i) and (ii) didn't come.

Neither did Anglican (iv).

But his curate did.

S·P·C·K SERAPH BOOKS

To be published 26th May

BURNING COALS OF FIRE

Violet Welton **5s**

Can there be a "Church of tomorrow"—or has mediocrity succeeded where persecution failed? Miss Welton's examination of the situation and outlook of your people today evades no issues, and the Church must heed her warning if it is to carry its message to the coming generation.

TO WHOM PAUL WROTE

Mabel C. Warburton **4s 6d**

It is always easier to read a letter with understanding if one knows something of the person or persons to whom it is written. Here is an account of each of the Churches to which St. Paul wrote letters, an account made the more vivid by a recent tour of Greece and Asia Minor.

GOD'S PLAN

F. Hood **4s 6d**

Canon Hood's book, first published in 1955 and now taking its place as a *Seraph*, gives an account of the divine scheme for mankind, as set forth in Christ's teachings and in the life of the Church.

SPARROWS OF THE SPIRIT

Frank West **5s 6d**

A fascinating account of the evolution of the English parson as seen in the lives of ten clergymen who held livings in Nottinghamshire from 1583 to 1911.

Salvation

or Mormons in Surrey

John Woodgate

On the A22 to Eastbourne, not far from Lingfield race-course, and deep in Surrey teashop land, stands the only Mormon temple in Great Britain. It was completed two years ago at a cost of £343,000. Architecturally, it is the very reverse of English Perpendicular, nor is this surprising, since it belongs to the age of blast, not of the last enchantments of the Middle Ages. It is a bleak, almost featureless rectangle of white stone, with narrow loop-hole windows almost reaching the roof, and a pencil-sharp leaden spire.

I can give no account of its interior, since the profane are not admitted; nor, by any means are all Mormons, but only members of good standing and conduct who are recommended by a bishop. Mormon temples are emphatically not places of public worship, but of esoteric rites, of which the principal ones are the "sealing" of marriages, and the baptism of the dead. If a civil marriage is subsequently "sealed" in a Mormon temple, the pair are united after death, in heaven as on earth, as Mormons put it, Mormons believe absolutely in the resurrection of the body and sealed married couples can produce children in heaven "for time and all eternity". The living are baptised at the age of eight by total immersion, like Baptists. Public baths are a favoured place, and I have met a Mormon who was baptised in the public baths in Bradford. It is possible to baptise the dead by proxy, baptism being the only infallible means of salvation. As it is not possible to ascertain the wishes of the dead, it must be done without their consent. George Washington and Jefferson have both been baptised posthumously as Mormons.

The sect was founded in 1830 by a 25-year-old prophet, Joseph Smith. He was the son of a poor and ignorant farmer of Palmyra, New York, and himself had hardly any education. He began to have visions at the age of 15, and in 1823 had one of an angel unknown to Christian theology, Moroni the son of Mormon, who told him that at a certain spot he would find a stone box containing the

apocalyptic Book of Mormon, a supplement to the Bible, and equally divinely inspired. It was not until four years later that Smith declared that he had found the box, which contained thin gold plates inscribed in a language which he called "reformed Egyptian" and a pair of supernatural spectacles, Urim and Thummim, which enabled a reader to decipher the plates. Wearing Urim and Thummim, Smith declared the English translation to an assistant Oliver Cowdery, who with two other witnesses, swore he had seen the plates, which shortly disappeared. According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica* of 1878, the Book of Mormon was "a historical romance written by one Samuel Spalding, a crack-brained preacher: and the manuscript falling into the hands of an unscrupulous compositor, Sidney Rigdon, was copied by him and subsequently given to Smith".

Smith began to baptise converts, and had another revelation proclaiming him "seer, translator, prophet, apostle of Jesus Christ and elder of the church". Prophets are restless folk, and he soon migrated with his followers to Kirtland, Ohio, which was to be the site of the New Jerusalem. Another revelation directed the Mormons to dedicate all their property to God, and start a bank, of which Smith became the first president, in addition to his duties as seer, prophet and apostle of Jesus Christ. Kirtland was soon flooded with worthless banknotes, which so enraged the depositors that they dragged Smith and Rigdon from their beds and tarred and feathered them. The bank scandal, and Smith's disreputable private life might have led to the shipwreck of the Mormons, had they not been joined at this time by Brigham Young, a glazier by trade, of indomitable will-power, eloquence, and a genius for organisation. He went on a preaching tour of the eastern states, founded the first Mormon temple at Kirtland, and despatched the first missionaries to England, where they had considerable success in the industrial districts of Lancashire, the Midlands and South Wales, which are still their strongholds. The Mormons moved again, this time to Missouri, where their milleniary prophesies and pretensions to sainthood, so manifestly disproved by Smith's personal life, incurred so much hostility from other churches which they referred to as "gentile", that a small civil war broke out and was supressed with difficulty by the militia. Smith and Rigdon were imprisoned on charges of treason, murder and felony, but managed to escape to Illinois, where they founded a city called Nauvoo. Smith had an insatiable

appetite for power and domination. He had already founded a subsidiary sect called the Danites for the purpose of upholding his revelations and decrees above the laws of the land, and of obtaining supreme power, first over Illinois, and later the whole United States. At Nauvoo he obtained a government charter, installed himself as mayor, president of the church, and though a life-long civilian, lieutenant-general of the Nauvoo legion. His inclinations had always been polygamous, and in 1843 he had a new revelation establishing polygamy. This was his downfall and led to his death. A newspaper-owner published some articles attacking Smith, who retorted by destroying his office, expelling him from Nauvoo, and, when the militia appeared, calling the Mormons to arms. Again a small civil war nearly broke out, but Smith was apprehended and lodged in Carthage jail, where a mob broke in by night and murdered him, together with his brother Hyrum. He was thirty-nine.

In his end was the Mormons' beginning, for the capable and practical Brigham Young was their next president. Their fortunes hit the bottom when Nauvoo had its charter rescinded and was cannonaded by government troops. Young decided to emigrate far from the scene of Smith's disordered career and the malice of gentiles. He led the great trek of pioneers across the Colorado Mountains to Utah, which was then Mexican territory, and did not become a fully-fledged United State until 1896. The Mormons settled on the desolate shores of the Great Salt Lake, which their persistance and hard work turned into fertile agricultural land. Utah has become industrialised in this century, and is very rich in minerals, with great resources of coal and oil, the biggest copper-mine in the world, as well as uranium and gold. About threequarters of the population are Mormons.

It has been claimed that the book of Mormon is the second most widely read book in the world, but such claims are not susceptible of proof or disproof. It is written in a pseudo-biblical but unliterary style and divided into verses, chapters and books, called the books of Nephi, Jacob, Enos, Jarom, Omni, Mormon, Mosiah, Alma, Helaman, Ether and Moroni. It is supposed to be a chronicle of the pre-historic inhabitants of America, all of whom were descended from a family of Jews, Lehi and his wife Sariah, and their four sons, Laman, Lemuel, Sam, and Nephi, who left Jerusalem after the destruction of the Tower of Babel, took ship from the south of Arabia, and sailed without an intervening port of call to the Pacific coast of

Chile. Of course they suffered the most appalling trials, dissensions, temptations to sin, and attacks by malicious gentiles.

Mormons have changed greatly since the ill reign of the prophet-president Smith. They are a law-abiding, exclusive and puritanical sect, who abhor tobacco, alcohol, tea and coffee. A faint whiff of polygamy still clings to them in the popular mind, but in fact they abandoned it over sixty years ago. It was only in 1896 that an American federal law made it entirely illegal. Mormons are seldom rich, but their church is, since they have no professional priesthood, and all are expected to pay a tithe of their gross income to the church, as well as an additional 2 per cent to their local ward. They ought to fast from two meals on the first Sunday of every month, and give the equivalent money to charity. They are opposed to all forms of government aid and welfare, but keep great stores of food and clothing, from which Mormon priests relieve the poor. Evangelistic work overseas is conducted by young people who go abroad at their own expense for two years without taking any paid work there, and strive diligently to convert the gentiles by house-to-house visits and preaching. A curious feature of their organisation is that all boys can be ordained priests at the age of twelve.

There are only two Mormon temples in Europe, one in England, the other in Switzerland. They have no branches in Communist countries, and hardly any in Asia. They appear to flourish in the Pacific, as there are temples in Hawaii and New Zealand, as well as Mormon communities in Australia, Tahiti, Tonga, and Samoa.

What influence have Mormons in England? I should say hardly any. It is difficult to ascertain their exact number, but I am sure they do not exceed 15,000, mostly in industrial districts of the north and midlands. Their great white fane in Surrey attracts a good many sightseers who are disappointed at not being able to go inside. Perhaps they have converted 150 souls in the surrounding district in two years, but other churches have shown resentment, and the local garage-hands, small farmers and ladies who keep folk-weave tea-shops decorated with Gothic lettering have displayed the English countryside's bovine indifference to the intruder, even should he speak with the tongues of men and angels.

Service Overseas

GEORGINA BATTISCOMBE

Why should every parish priest be expected to remain in England? Returning to this country after several years spent in Africa—I was struck by the insular, not to say parochial, nature of English religion, I sometimes wonder whether those earnest people who make such a song and a dance over the shortage of clergy in England and the sad fate of congregations who have to make do with the ministrations of a lay-reader have ever paused to consider whether such congregations are *really* deprived of the sacraments. If every second Church in England were to be closed worshippers would but have to take car, bicycle, scooter or the local bus and even in remote country districts they would find another church open and functioning within a very few miles. In a town they might well find one in the next street. Contrast this state of affairs with the situation in Africa and the moral is obvious.

This narrow parochialism crops up again and again in Church matters. Members of diocesan committees for the care of churches are constantly coping with the problem of gifts given to one particular church for no better reason than sentimentality. Dear Aunt Mabel always worshipped in St. Jude's Bumbleton, therefore in St. Jude's Bumbleton her memorial must be. St. Jude's is already over-equipped with what the French describe as "objets de piete", and what is really needed is a new boiler, but nobody would consider a boiler to be either a seemly or a showy memorial to Aunt Mabel. So in English churches we get bishops' chairs in which a bishop will seldom if ever sit and bookcases for books which nobody will ever read, whilst in Africa congregations worship with only an apology for a roof over their heads. Even the belongings of churches which have been bombed or pulled down as redundant are regarded as sacrosanct; their church plate was given for use in Slocombe-cum-Addleshaw, and somewhere in Slocombe-cum-Addleshaw it must remain, although in Tanganyika and Nyassaland priests are using Dettol bottles for altar cruets.

Lack of imagination is the root cause of this deplorable attitude. Nowadays we seldom hear a missionary sermon, and if people are not told about the Church overseas they certainly will not take the

trouble to find out for themselves. But better than sermons would be actual contact, a constant coming and going between the Church at home and abroad.

The man who has a definite call to the priesthood but who dreads the thought of settling down for the whole of his life in an English parish, may, however, be perfectly prepared to spend a large part of it there (especially if he is, or hopes to be, a married man) provided that he can look forward at some period to a spell of work in other and less familiar surroundings. When a man joins the Army, Navy or Air Force he definitely expects to spend some part of his service abroad. Why should this not be true of men joining the Church's Ministry? To be a professional missionary demands specialised training, and a special vocation. There are, however, plenty of places abroad which are not actually part of "the mission-field", and where such question as the language difficulty would not arise. I should like to see it taken for granted by every Ordination candidate that he would be spending at least two years of his ministry in one of the Dominions, or as Chaplain to the English colony in some foreign city, or in the service of some such organisation as Missions to Seamen, or perhaps best of all, in the United States. It ought to be possible, for instance, to arrange some sort of exchange system with young clergy from the autonomous Anglican Churches overseas. The gain both to the Church at home and the Church abroad would be great: no English parish could remain in insular ignorance of overseas affairs if its Rector had just returned from Matabeleland and its Curate were about to take off for Madagascar, whilst churches overseas would equally profit by this living link with their mother-church in England. The greatest gain, however, would be to the clergy themselves. The adventurous would no longer feel stultified because their whole life must be cribbed, cabined and confined within the bounds of English parishes, whilst the unadventurous would be obliged, at least once in a lifetime, to take a look at new places, new ideas, new people. The Church needs to attract young men of enterprise into her Ministry; she also needs to inject the spirit of enterprise into some of the men who are already her ministers. This scheme of two years' overseas service might meet both needs. Why not give it a trial?

Red Herrings and Soft Answers

VALERIE PITT

Well, says Robert Hughes, the gin was lovely. What about the steak and onion? When will Miss Pitt present her body building plan for the Church? It is a flattering invitation—straight into hell's parlour. I shall decline it. But if I have no prophetic panaceas I do have some things to say to Robert Hughes.

He requires that Anglican tautology "constructive criticism". But criticism isn't just walloping about. The critic may be mistaken in his views, but what he says even in the fiercest of satire, must proceed from his perception of right. He attacks the unjust and the silly in order to assert justice and sanity. But this of course, is not what Fr. Hughes wants. He wants my alternative scheme for experimenting with the Church. Well—here is a parable for him.

There was once a Prelate, of an older vintage than ours, who died, and was confronted with the record of his words. There were the *avant garde* books proving that Christianity was necessary to the human psyche, but historically untrue, there were the prize giving speeches, and the society christenings. And there too, were the ignorant untaught, the mourners uncomforted, the social evils unrebuked. And, as he was led away to the appropriate purgatorial flame, the Bishop was heard to mutter "How very unconstructive". "Unconstructive?" said the Angel. "Yes", said the Bishop, "of course it is valuable to be warned about these pitfalls, and I am grateful. But what about some practical suggestions." "There were", said the Angel, "your consecration promises". In this story the angel acts as a critic. That is, he brought together what was, and what should have been. The Christian critic neither can, nor ought to pretend to private messages for the Church: what he does is to appeal to the commonplace Christian experience. And what I said in my article was very commonplace, that is, that if we make our actions even our good actions, the raison d'etre of the Christian life we shall have to repent not of the works themselves—but of the evil we brought to the doing of them. Works are only fruitful, if and only

if, they spring from the will of God. There are actions which humanly speaking, appear to be good and desirable, but are forbidden as a sin against God, or against our neighbour. We see this when our Lord refused to command the stones to become bread, or to call twelve regiments of angels to rescue Him from the Passion. Fr. Hughes is quite right: this may well lead to paralysis, but it is the paralysis of the Cross. For in the economy of God it is not activity which matters, but obedience. Even in Woolwich.

May we get rid of that red herring. Fr. Hughes says that he writes as the member of a team of clergy at St. Mary's, Woolwich. That team has existed about four months; not long enough for its excellent intentions to make a public difference between St. Mary's and any other reasonably active parish. I know indeed that there is a grand strategy, because the Rector told me so, and my views on his proposals were not quite as Robert Hughes has represented them. But in the nature of things I cannot be as seriously concerned in them as the clergy are: it was even possible for me to write about the temptation of good works without thinking of Woolwich. I hope Fr. Hughes can forgive me the indifference.

But St. Mary's *is* a reforming church. Let's look at it. Nicolas Stacey was sent there by a reforming Bishop with a reforming commission, and he was given, or has acquired a staff of four clergymen. Now Fr. Stacey is a very capable young man, much more of an old fashioned Catholic, and less of a gimmick boy than he will allow himself or the public to suspect. But he does believe that works must not only be done but seen to be done, and this leads him, as I have more than once told him, to undervalue the quieter vocation, the less spectacular achievement. When he does things they have to be on a grand scale. St. Mary's will have a coffee bar and become a social centre for the Parish. There is good reason to hope it will. But I have watched a single-handed priest on a housing estate turn his church into a community centre (rock and roll on Saturday nights, the Parish Eucharist on Sunday mornings) and build a congregation from absolute scratch. Again, St. Mary's is going to work a team ministry, which Fr. Hughes says airily, is not economically justifiable at present, but will, in the future, justify its cost by helping other parishes out. There are team ministries which are economically justified because the clergy pay for them by sacrificing domestic and financial independence, at St. Augustine's, Tonge Moor, and St. Columba's, Sunderland, both C.M.P. parishes, and

both in industrial areas. But I wonder if Fr. Hughes realises just how tactless he is in making such a flourish about the St. Mary's team. What parish priest would not like a staff of that size, and who would not, on any method, double and treble his congregations with that kind of help. The Southwark clergy would not be human if they did not suspect, as this Southwark lay person suspects, that in the distribution of man-power something less than justice has been done to many of those hard-working, lonely clerics for whom Fr. Hughes is so much concerned. Whatever the St. Mary's team achieves will be achieved in exceptionally favourable conditions, and will tell us nothing about the value of its methods for other parishes. And there is just one question: if Evangelism in Woolwich required the spanking new, and the bright publicity, why is it that the shabby Roman Church round by the Woolwich Post Office has nearly a hundred people, many of them communicants, at a week-day lunch hour Mass?

Reformers are not necessarily self-satisfied, but they do make their insights and experiments, even their impatience, the measure of Christian perfection. Those who do not fall in with them are seen as obstructionists to be over-ridden in the great cause. It is nonsense to suggest that Miss Forsythe is always carefully considered. I will give Fr. Hughes one and fourpence, the fare there and back to a church (non-Woolwich) where a new, reforming Vicar has, in six months, alienated half his congregation by rushing changes where a wiser man would have waited to gain their confidence. It is reasonable to ask for sacrifices in the cause of reform. It is not reasonable, indeed it is a sin, to use a spiritual authority to enforce practices which however urgent they may appear to Bishop or priest have neither appeal nor content to his unwilling flock. As I have said before in this journal, the Body of Christ is not the private possession of zealous ecclesiastics.

The interesting thing is that it is not the pioneers who make the fuss. Luther Change-the-Lot is busy waving his placards demanding that the Church attend to him, while quieter people get on with it. It is, for instance, ten years since I first attended a Eucharist celebrated from the West, and that was in Cardiff not Cambridge. Every Friday at half past eight in the evening I make my Communion with a number of Miss Forsythes, although we have, unfortunately, no reforming team in our parish. And if Fr. Hughes really wants to know why I find Anglican priest workmen irritating—I'll tell him.

First I have a veneration for Charles de Foucauld whose theology and example inspired the movement and I find the spate of Anglican articles on "my identification with the Masses", unimpressive after that moving silence. Second, I was born working class, and live and work with people of the same origin. I do not care for the *de haute en bas* "let's let down to their level" attitude which informs so many discussions of the Church in Industry. The thing has become, not a discipline of renewal but a fashionable version of "work among the lower orders". For who talks about stockbroker priests, or identifying with the management? Who in all the hoo ha mentions the existence of the working class intelligentsia? Even the Editor of PRISM needs to be reminded, judging from his reference to Brasted in *Time and Tide*, that people of working class origin can have academic qualifications. And the Bishop of Southwark should hear my mother on the New English Bible.

Some of these subjects could be developed at length—and probably will be. Fr. Hughes must try to remember and remind his colleagues that the Christian situation is not something peculiar to Woolwich, or to Reformers. The rest of us also endure it and find the reforming analysis often unacceptable.

The Church Union's **Thirty-sixth Summer School of Sociology** will take place at Jesus College, Oxford, between 31st July and 4th August, 1961. The theme will be "The Christian Understanding of Equality". Enquiries to: The Summer School Secretary, The Church Union, 6 Hyde Park Gate, London, S.W.7.

An **Ecumenical Conference** will be held on 28th and 29th November, 1961, for clergy and ministers of the Greater London Area. The theme will be "The Holy Communion in the Church Today". Enquiries to: The Rev. N. B. Cryer, 23 Havelock Road, Addescombe, Surrey.

Made for Man

RAYMOND CHAPMAN

The old arguments about the sabbatarian principle have been gone over many times. The Fourth Commandment is quoted in support of the belief that all normal activities should be suspended on Sunday This Judaic law is held to override the saying of Christ, "The sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath", and his examples of healing and compassion on the sabbath which aroused the wrath of the pharisees. It may be remarked also that even the Old Testament sabbath is not appointed as a day of gloom and denial but of rest and refreshment. It took the English puritans to equate the first day of the week with the seventh—a remarkable piece of numerology even for the lunatic fringe—and then to celebrate the joyful Resurrection by forbidding people to show any signs of joy. Let it be fairly admitted that their intention was genuinely to safeguard the observance of public worship on Sundays. Later sabbatarians have also been actuated by the humane social motive, which appears to underlie the Mosaic code, of ensuring adequate rest for workers and servants. Unfortunately, they were not and are not prepared to let an act of compassion be its own end, without insisting on how the granted leisure shall be spent.

Let it be admitted also that the social purpose of sabbatarian laws has been endorsed and assured by the secular state. On the other hand, the religious purpose no longer dominates the scene. The modern attitude to Sunday is that it is a day for getting up late, having a big dinner, reading the extra-large newspapers of the day and generally being old clothed and unshaven. It is hard to be stern against those who have to rise very early six days a week, if they claim the indulgence to sleep longer on Sundays—(and this is another argument for the Parish Communion and Evening Mass instead of the rigid "Eight o'clock"). Certainly we do not want to see our unbelieving friends fined for recusancy, and we can be happy in the thought that our congregations come in willing and loving obedience and not from legal or social pressure. Yet there are those who, in the name of Christianity, are prepared to invoke the power of the state courts. If they can no longer compel people to go to church, at least they can try to stop them from going anywhere else. There are

old laws which forbid the opening of places of entertainment on Sundays—it is an Act of 1780 which is most often used here—and since the English attitude of "we've always done it that way" is allowed to prevail, the laws remain in force.

The Lord's Day Observance Society lays itself open to attack from those of us who dislike the idea of legislating men into religious attitudes. If its members were content to argue and persuade to preach and write about their belief, we could only dispute with them in charity. It is their use of secular power to enforce conduct in others which must make us work to have the law repealed.

Are we then to abolish Sunday and say that its traditional duties are no longer binding on Christians? By no means, for it is desirable to keep times and seasons lest the great truths which they symbolise become neglected. The rhythm of the passing weeks and of the ecclesiastical year is deeply wise in many ways. Not only does it offer a perpetual memory of Christ's earthly life, it also answers to man's psychological need for change and pattern. We cannot endure perpetual feasting or perpetual mourning, unrelieved asceticism or endless self-indulgence. The world is poorer in more ways than it realises for its retreat from the laws of the Church. It is in joy, not fearful negation, that we keep Sunday.

Even if the sabbatarians were correct in their attitude to Sunday, the laws which they invoke would still be inconsistent, unedifying and therefore ludicrous. One of the severest restrictions is on the public performance of plays, a prohibition which can be edged around by various devices. Those who believe that drama can be a great medium for the spreading and strengthening of faith do not want to resort to shabby means to cheat a hostile law. The Religious Drama Society of Great Britain has encountered difficulties of this kind, and is hoping shortly to begin a campaign to have the position officially altered. This is but one aspect of a law which helps people to misunderstand what Sunday really means. It is a bad law, a senseless and frustrating law. Let it be repealed, in the name of those who truly love Sunday, for its worship, peace and refreshment.

Letter from Korea

ROGER TENNANT

Apart from the Philippines, South Korea is "the most Christian country in Asia", with some two million Christians, mostly Presbyterians, in a population of twenty-five million. A Korean city has as many churches as any European city, and more denominations. There are more Presbyterians in Seoul than in Edinburgh, Geneva, or any other Calvinistic centre, and probably more church attendances on Sunday than in any other national capital. Korea has never been the object of any large English ambitions, commercial or religious, and the Anglican Church, although it has eighty years of history, counts about 7,000 members and 4,000 communicants.

The Protestant missions have been almost entirely fundamentalist, and early attempts to introduce liberal ideas resulted in heresy trials and fanatical resistance. By screening its missionaries the Presbyterian Mission has, even to this day, limited the liberals to a persecuted minority, but now they are rapidly growing. The fundamentalist stranglehold has been broken, but it will be a long time before news of the victory reaches village congregations.

Because of this, the influence of the Church, as such, in the intellectual or political world, has been negligible, but the influence of Christ and the ideas of the Bible know no bounds, and cannot easily be assessed. The Korean Bible Society sells about a million bibles a year, and modern Korean literature is almost as full of biblical echoes and Christian assumptions about man as that of the West.

Being pre-occupied with revivalism and hymn-singing, which often goes on all night, the Church has rarely given a lead in any situation. There were no Christian martyrs under the Rhee regime, and most Christian pastors were as active as any one in seeing that everyone voted the right way, The Christian newspapers sang his praises up to the day of revolution, and the students of the Christian University were the last to join in the demonstrations.

The Churches, both Catholic and Protestant, are active in anti-Communist propaganda. The commanders of the new atomic rocket sites that are springing up all over South Korea are plagued with priests and pastors asking for aid in building churches, but no

one dreams of questioning the assumptions on which the sites are being built. Since the revolution of April 1960 a few left-wing voices have been heard, but the Government is now pushing through new "anti-Communist laws" which will once again drive them underground.

The salvation of Korea, in material terms, depends on industry, but so far no appreciable progress has been made, and cannot be as long as the country is tied to the idea of free enterprise. Free enterprise pre-supposes capitalists, and in Korea the only capitalists are money-lenders or merchants who would not dream of being industrialists. What sane man would risk his money in industry when he can get 10 per cent a month by lending it to the needy? If the Government starts a factory, it is usually just a means of subsidising the operators, until the American grant is used up, and the doors shut. Industry also presupposes engineers and artisans, but this is a chicken or egg problem that private enterprise cannot tackle. If Korea could open its doors to Japanese industrialists, some progress might be made, but "Down with the Japs" is second only to "Down with the Reds" as a popular slogan. Communism is not the answer that anyone wants, but for lack of any alternative it looks like being the only possible answer.

During the Korean War, South Koreans experienced Communism in its most barbaric and ruthless form, and the general public hates and fears it. They know that if peaceful unification comes they will not have the means or the moral strength to overcome it. Thus they unenthusiastically accept the American occupation, as the lesser evil, and think as little as possible about the future. England is in very much the same position. In neither land are there many with the courage to say that it would be better to live with communism than to destroy the world. So if Korean Christians, in their perplexity, say, "Pray for us", they must also say "Pray for yourselves, daughters of London."

Stewards heretical

J. M. Bickersteth

We have been thoroughly heretical in our Stewardship Scheme: and remain unrepentant about it. In other words we had a need, and we used Stewardship to supply it. Pundits, read no further: but if there are any fellow untouchables—or embryo ones—I gladly share our experiences with them.

But first to begin where it is usually quite good to begin—with the Bible. 1 Chronicles 29 is much quoted by all of us who get the Stewardship bug, and there can be few finer "prayers for use in Stewardship campaigns" than David's: "All that is the heavens and in the earth is thine . . . Both riches and honour come from Thee . . . For all things come of Thee and of Thine own have we given Thee."

And what, pray, was the giving for? Let David speak again: "Hear me, my brethren and my people, I had it in my heart to build a house of rest for the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord . . . the palace will not be for man but for the Lord, so I have provided, so far as I was able, the gold . . . then the heads of father's houses made their freewill offerings . . . they gave for the service of the house of God five thousand talents . . . and whoever had precious stones gave them . . . then the people rejoiced." And finally in 2 Chronicles 2 when the work began "The house which I am to build will be great: for our God is greater than all Gods."

This is what the money was for. The people who gave (or perhaps the sons of the people who gave) saw their money working. In the hands of skilled men the simple gift offered was turned to the Lord's use.

So was another simple gift offered many centuries later—the loaves and fish of a boy's picnic which (how he would have laughed) have found their way on to the excellent literature of the Central Board of Finance of the Church of England. The skill this time was not the skill of many, but the skill of One: while the need this time was not that of One, but of many.

Need, notice, again: and a pretty desperate need at that. A large crowd was very hungry and there were no shops for miles. Something had to be done. A boy's generosity tipped the scales. He gave what he had, and the Lord used it. So much so that there was plenty over:

how it was dealt with we are tantalisingly never told, but presumably it was given away.

Thus it would seem that two of the classic Scripture passages on this subject, the stock-in-trade of every Stewardship preacher, are concerned with generous giving to meet a need. To go from the timeless and the sublime to this parish and 1958, we had a need. We were faced with the task of expanding a church building which catered for a pre-first war population of 750, to one which could house the congregation beginning to gather from 4,000 people. We had to extend the church: but in fact, of course, we began to realise that we had to Extend the Church. The one could not go without the other. How we phrased it on that first leaflet, nearly two years ago now, was "If several hundred families here could start to give thoughtfully then we should achieve:

(i) A new sense of personal responsibility for the Church, from which will come a greater conviction that we really belong to it: and

(ii) The visible result of our efforts in the form of the completed church building, something to hand on to future generations to the Glory of God."

I see that in our first report on the progress of the plan some months later we put it the other way round, but this I think has no significance. Thus:

"The Objects of our Plan are:

(i) To enlarge and complete our church building as soon as possible.

(ii) To become more outward looking, and grasp our wider Christian Responsibilities at home and abroad.

We chose the phrase 'Extending Our Church' because it embodies these two objects."

A Second Report in July 1960 indicated the main lines of progress: seventeen adults, a record number, prepared for confirmation: an active men's group: the Youth Club mounting a full-length play in the local theatre: sixty men and women taking part in Lent Discussion Groups: and in sheer hard cash an average of £83 a week instead of £25 under the old scheme of things.

Behind the next report, not necessarily in it, will be these reflections, some to disturb, some to encourage, some simply to note:

1. More than fifty men, fifty-four to be precise, visiting on behalf of the Church cannot fail to make an impression. ("Please do not come near my house", wrote a parishioner to one of the Church

Builders, as we call them, "but I would like you to know how enormously struck I am by your being prepared to bother to do so.") This view has predominated by far, both in the original 600 visits and in the follow-up.

2. You can ask a person on the fringe of the Church's life for a responsible gift towards completing the building much more easily than you can speak to them of the "need of the giver to give". In other words our bricks and mortar activities have paved the way for something deeper. It is always possible that King David's impassioned appeal led to the congregation realising a little more of what it meant to "be the Church".

3. Only about ten per cent of the 400 families in our scheme can even remotely be said to be Stewarding. In other words the great majority have come in with a couple of shillings or half-a-crown a week. Most of our people live in council houses; many have a thousand a year coming into the home, so that five pounds is a miserably small sum. But the point is that two years ago they were not contributing a penny piece to the life of the Church; or at the most it was a shilling on Armistice Sunday and the same at Christmas and Easter. One Church Builder said to me the other day, "I used to think God ought to be jolly pleased when I made it one-and-sixpence!" Yes, but that same man is now a Church Builder, right in, and really stewarding at a pound a week. Whereas Bill Bloggins is where he had not even got to a year or two back. Bill is already giving more generously and regularly than he was then. The process has at least begun. Real Stewardship may well follow. So I do not agree with official literature which says that we should have no use for the man or woman who comes in on the so-much-for-a-start or every-little-helps basis.

4. All the indications are that when we begin the physical part of the Church Extension in a month's time (£18,000 it is going to cost; we are making a start with the £6,000 invested in the past twenty months), a considerable spurt will be seen in people's giving. We have every hope that the fairly steady average of eighty pounds a week will go up to a hundred. (I heard recently of a Congregational Church where the weekly average is £152, and the people apparently think nothing of it.) For Anglican congregations anyway, it would seem that some sort of spur is a good thing. When there is no bricks and mortar required, no new curate to provide for, no hall to redecorate (will that ever be the case?) some definite project from the

Church Overseas could work wonders, e.g. a launch for the Bishop of Borneo, or equipment for a metal workshop in a Copper Belt school.

5. To step up away-giving while saving for the job in hand at home is essential to the health of the scheme. We have set as a minimum target one-fifth of our new money: so £625 pounds went out of the parish last year, excluding the Quota. This compares with £245 in 1958, the last full year before the scheme began. To decide upon the allocation of this money is an important task of the Finance Committee, which hears suggestions (we find several are made), and has a proportion arrangement whereby the Christian's particular concern for church causes is kept to the fore. In other words it is not necessarily the local church's job to increase what is given to Earl Haig's Fund, or the Royal Agricultural Benevolent Institution; admirable as their work is, such extra funds as they need can come from philanthropically-minded people who would feel no call to give, for example, to the Training of Ordination Candidates, or the Missions to Seamen.

6. To go to people outside the life of the Church and hope that if you can persuade them to give their money to the Lord they will subsequently give their hearts, is an enterprise doomed to failure and probably an immoral one anyway.

7. But how to build into the life of the Church the man who has asked to join the scheme, who religiously (?) brings his envelope to the wall safe once a week, but who in two years has not yet put in one single appearance at a Church Service? This is a teaser, much on the minds of the Extension Committee. Our nearest approach to him is that once he came to a Church Extension Party in the Hall. He is the kind of inveterate non-church goer! It is possible that he prays as he puts in the envelope, but it must be a quickie, for he is bicycling down the church path again in a matter of second. Why does he belong at all, you may say? Perhaps because his elder brother helped to build the church forty years ago. I for one would not care to be the man to tell him we did not want his money; and anyhow who are we to say that God does not commend that man for his detour on the way home to tea?

We come back to the need again, to what is tangible and visible. In none of our visiting have we said, "Look, this is going to cost £18,000. What are you prepared to do to help?" We have said, "You belong to the World-wide Church. Money is some expression

of caring. Will you begin to care?" Our Statements of Good Intent say nothing about Three Years; why ever should they? We are not expecting those we visit to leave the Church in three years. We and they assume life membership. But our present job in hand is the completion of the building, with several decent basketfuls for away-giving. Later on the proportion will change, and what we now contribute to the life of the wider Church will seem as pathetic as it really is; later on people will have got into the habit of regular worthwhile giving; later on the percentage of those who are doing some proper budgeting will increase enormously. But we must walk before we can run; and in the Church of England we were not moving at all, stewardship-wise, until five years ago. Let us stop, then, being ashamed of our needs; let us thank God for them, and as we rise to meet them find that we are beginning to contribute in a new way to the Extension of Christ's Church throughout the world.

Letters

CATECHISM

Dear Sir,

May I correct Valerie Pitt? Our Tudor and Stuart Fathers were far from wanting to water down the New Testament requirement of Baptism and Holy Communion for everyone when they described the two Gospel sacraments as *generally necessary to salvation.* For them (though not for us) *generally* meant "universally". *Generally necessary* is admirably rendered into modern English "needed by all". But like Valerie Pitt I am less happy when *salvation* becomes "fulness of life in him". But I am glad not to be obliged to suggest an alternative.

Yours sincerely,

All Saints, Margaret St. KENNETH N. ROSS.

CORRECTION

Dear Sir,

May I please be allowed to point out that in your April issue, the last word of the ninth line on page 5 should be "chaotic" not "catholic".

I do not want to be fussy, but I doubt if even the most liberal of

Anglicans could make these two words mean quite the same thing.

Yours sincerely,

St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden. MARTIN THORNTON.

"LET HIM COME TO ME"

Dear Sir,

Your correspondent has apparently done much breath-taking travel, reminiscent of the tourist doin' Yurrup and missing 'most everything of consequence en route.

He seems unable to distinguish between a confessor and a director. The latter need not be a priest (cf. Von Hugel and Evelyn Underhill). Circumstances may dictate the necessity for both, but not often. Brother Lawrence said he had no need of a director, but much need of a confessor; a woman saint (I forget which) tells that Our Lord reproved her for seeking counsel of her confessor, when He Himself was directing her.

Confession is always made to the One Eternal High Priest, and the human partaker of His priesthood, whatever his eccentricities, or his trappings (or lack of them) matters not at all. The priest who is also a penitent must surely know sufficient to begin with. Experience teaches him, and the Ordinal speaks of receiving the Holy Ghost and the Church's authority for his office. He may rely on textbooks, and be none the worse for that. The penitent approaching with the right dispositions normally finds any advice, if given (and this is by no means always the case) apposite at the moment. In this writer's experience—50 years of it—there is seldom much contradiction, be the priest a well-known expert, or a young man in his first curacy.

It may be true that priests are not leading their people to confession. Who knows? The incumbent who is fortunately not answerable to people like your contributor, knows his people, and may be starting with his confirmees. It was so in my own case. I was a regular penitent before I saw a vestment. It was always by appointment only, and my vicar would have failed every test applied in the PRISM unofficial survey (may we so call the article?) but my gratitude to him is no less because of that. If the priest is leading his people to penitence then "The way and means thereto" will be found.

Is sin so complex? A well-known priest once pointed out that there are only ten commandments, and apart from omission, three ways of breaking each. Once or twice in a lifetime it happens that some knotty problem of conscience crops up, requiring expert

guidance. Seldom is this appropriate: to the confessional. Incidentally it then requires more than the fifteen minutes envisaged by your correspondent. Normally our "problems" are simpler than we like to think, as the woman at the well of Samaria found.

In a future issue perhaps a priest will come back with something about penitents.

S.W.11. I. BUXTON (Miss).

REPENTANCE

Dear Sir,

I trust that your mailbags have already been stuffed to overflowing with protests against the cartoon which appeared on page 23 of the March PRISM, but I should still like to add my ½ oz. of vituperation. To list the all too apparent objections to this cartoon would only be wearisome to the flesh and I am sure that the editor of almost any of the "popular" dailies would be quite prepared to give you, Sir, several reasons why he would not allow such a cartoon to appear *in his own paper*—let alone in PRISM.

If, Sir, PRISM had been a stable-mate not only of *Time and Tide* but also of one of the more salacious Sunday papers, I might charitably have assumed that the printer had mixed up his blocks. In the absence of such potentially exonerating circumstances, I can only suggest that the Editor should have *his* block un-mixed-up or, failing that cure, chopped off.

Yours, appalled,

S.E. 7. J. D. FERGUSON.

[Of course the cartoon would not have been suitable for a popular daily nor for that matter for the National Christian News. Whether funny or not, it was perfectly *suitable* for PRISM, since, thank God, we can safely assume that our readers are intelligent and instructed and therefore not likely to be misled by it.—ED.]

LENT

Dear Sir,

So you find "Forty Days, etc." dreary. On reading it I don't find it so dreary. Is it not the time, which most organists seem to play as a drawl? Isn't it really the *tune* "Heinlern" is at fault? I learned many years ago to change for the last two verses to "Buckland", 444 in A. and M. (revised) which is quite an improvement. Try it, dear Sir!

Yours faithfully,

Birkenhead. (Signed) C.F.L.

I BELIEVE

Dear Sir,

When I wrote in the February issue of PRISM under the heading "I believe" I had no wish to offend the religious susceptibilities of anyone. It is, however, a constant source of amazement to me that communicants can continue to think the way they do.

When your correspondent suggests that I should consult the Book of Common Prayer to see what Anglicans believe she in fact means her own interpretation, for how can she speak for anyone else? The history of religion in general and Anglicanism in particular is a witness to this. The Creed does not begin with "We" but "I".

The Book of Common Prayer (which Miss Paull implies is the manifesto of Anglicanism) is not an end in itself but a means to the End which is God. When God is achieved as He should be in the Sacrament and *ipso facto* in the mind and heart of the individual the soul enters a new dimension in which the B.C.P., the Bible and the whole corpus of theology are nothing.

Doctrinal truth is subject to relativity. The soul cannot know truth but it can become Truth in God through Christ Who said, "I am the truth" and we cannot attain holiness except through Him, *Quonian tu solus sanctus*, but I would be the first to agree that the Book of Common Prayer helps.

THOMAS SPIERS.

S.W.1.

H-BOMB

Dear Sir,

Mr. Hammond says in effect that retaliation is morally wrong, therefore we mustn't have the H-bomb. His premise may be right, but how is it relevant? Surely is is a commonplace that the whole justification, if any, for our possession of the H-bomb lies in its deterrent power, so that it will never be used by anyone, rather than in its usefulness as an Imperialistic means of reprisal.

Had John the Baptist been armed with a sharp sword perhaps that particular tragedy would never have occurred. But presumably Mr. Hammond would have denied him this precaution lest he wilfully ran amok at the court of Herod "bashing and slashing male and female", etc.

Yours,

JOHN WAUCHOPE.

S.W.3.

The Melchester Tradition

RONALD DISS

"Salisbury Theological College, which is seeking a playing field, did not want to turn out namby-pamby parsons like the stage caricature, but tough parsons for a tough job", the Principal, Canon F. C. Tindall, said yesterday at a public enquiry at Salisbury.

(*Newspaper Report*)

Scene: The Entrance Hall of the College. It is the first day of term, and students are returning laden with their tennis racquets, water skis, javelins, etc. There is a lot of noisy cheerful laughter, and the men greet each other with a friendly slap on the back or a playful punch. One man, obviously new, stands alone. He is approached by a lithe, alert-looking young man in flannels.

PHILLIPS (*to new man*): Hallo, you new? I'm Phillips. What's your name?

NEW MAN: Oh, er, hallo. Yes, I am new. My name is Coote.

PHILLIPS: Well, Coote, let's see which room you're in, and get your luggage along there right away, shall we? (*He quickly casts an eye over the notice board.*) Ah, yes, here it is. Room 5. Come along then. (*They both pick up Coote's luggage, and Phillips leads off stage, with Coote following, looking distinctly unhappy.*)

Enter the VICE-PRINCIPAL, wearing a dressing-gown, a towel round his neck, and carrying a pair of boxing gloves under his arm. He pins a note onto the notice board, and is about to leave when PHILLIPS returns.

PHILLIPS: Ah, good afternoon Sir. I've just taken the new man, Coote, to his room. Seems very "down" Sir.

(*The* VICE-PRINCIPAL *removes his gum-shields before speaking.*)

VICE-PRINCIPAL: Good afternoon Phillips. Coote seems "down", doesn't he. Confidentially, Phillips, I'm not surprised. You may as well know straight away that Coote never got beyond getting a half-blue at University. He's bound to have a tough time of it here. (*He shakes his head doubtfully.*)

PHILLIPS (*Proudly*): Yes, but this is Melchester, Sir. If anywhere can make a good parson of Coote, it's Melchester!

VICE-PRINCIPAL (*smiling gently*): Yes, I suppose you're right, Phillips. Get much work done in the vac?

PHILLIPS: Quite a bit, Sir. I'm rather pleased with my sprint starts.
VICE-PRINCIPAL: Good for you! Talking of starts, how about taking Coote for a work-over in the gym? Might help to make him feel a bit happier, eh?
PHILLIPS: What a splendid idea, Sir! I'll call for him straight away.
VICE-PRINCIPAL: Yes, do that, Phillips. (*Phillips hurries off.*)
The VICE-PRINCIPAL, humming to himself, pulls on his boxing gloves and goes off slowly, shadow boxing.

(CURTAIN)

Comment

The Editor writes:

Through the kindness of James Portman an unusual book has just come into my hands. It is called *The Archbishop's Test*; it is written by E. M. Green and published by Morehouse-Barlow Co., New York, and is a selection of the Episcopal Book Club. It was first published in London in 1914 and belongs to a type of religious literature that was popular at that period—another which was a best seller was I think called *In His Steps*—and which depends for its point on working out what would happen if one or two of us did decide to follow Christ and obey the Sermon on the Mount. They are sentimental, fascinating, and a healthy corrective to a lot of our present thinking.

This book has particular relevance to the present situation in that it visualises a new Archbishop who asks his bishops and clergy simply to obey the Prayer Book for two years and see what happens. At the time when it was written this entailed adopting practices which were definitely High Church and sometimes the writer's sympathy in this direction overrides the careful working out of his theme. "Pleading the Holy Sacrifice daily" is not I believe something that you could support just from the Prayer Book. But on the whole the writer is talking about a position which central churchmanship has now reached and the book, though slight, has a combination of real Catholic teaching with true evangelical faith and innocence. It is to be hoped that someone will republish it in this country.

The Editor writes:

I do not want to raise again the vexed question "Abbey: Museum or Church?" in any major form but I am moved to plead for some interim improvements in the arrangements at Westminster Abbey.

I walked round both the Abbey and the Cathedral one afternoon in Holy Week and the difference in the atmosphere was shattering. The Abbey is a National Museum as well as a Church and the hands of the Dean and Chapter who I know to be most concerned about this problem, are tied by all sorts of considerations, legal, financial and sentimental. But while they are wrestling with the problem—and may I commend to their attention Brian Williams' article in this issue —could we please have a chapel set aside for prayer, clearly labelled as such, properly cut off from the noise in the body of the Abbey, containing nothing to attract the tourist. I am told that there is one, but if so it is certainly not well signposted—I walked twice round without finding it. Could we also have a priest permanently on duty so that everyone would know that here there *was* always a priest ready to hear confessions, give advice, etc. Alternatively if these services are for some reason impracticable, could we please have them provided in St. Margaret's next door with clear notices in the Abbey saying that they are there? St. Paul's is a model with well-signed chapels for prayer and notices saying that a priest will be available at three scheduled times during the day to hear confessions and give advice.

Poetry

ON A TRANSKEIAN ROAD

A woman opening a gate. I stopped at the sight.
To the children who stand all day and scramble to let you through
I toss a packet of sweets without losing speed,
But this was a strange thing: A woman alone, and not young,
Her kerchiefed face patient and marked with the feet of the years.
So I stopped and asked her why she was there.
She said, "I do it to give my son learning;
It costs twenty pounds a year at the Mission school.

He is sixteen now: I have done it since he was twelve.
In two years more he will be full of learning and ready to teach.
There was proud joy in her face, but her hands were knotted an
swollen.
I thought of the days of rain and the pitiless sun on the dust
Transkeian road.
In the kraal yonder there was water to fetch, mealies to stamp an
lands to be hoed.
But up on the highway the white men tossed pennies out of their car
And so she opened the gate.
I gave her some money, not much—
There are so many, so many—
And went on my way.
Sixteen years ago she had opened for him, for her son, the gate int
life:
Now she was opening the gate of the mind for her son:
For herself it would always be shut.
Better so, I said in my heart.
Your son, who was born to laughter, can find through that gat
only sorrow.
On your side of the gate there is hunger and aching muscles—an
laughter.
On this side he will find hurt, and loneliness such as he never knew
The loneliness of the mind among alien minds.
The old easy laughter will come no more.
In my heart I said to the woman: Let him be:
Keep him on your side of the gate. He will be happier so.
But the look on the woman's face silenced my argument for it said
"I do this because it is good."
And I knew it was good.
Not today, not tomorrow, but afterwards
We shall see its good proved.
Those who work evil must hurry, must snatch their reward.
Time is their enemy. "That thou doest, do quickly".
Good can afford to wait, for Time is her friend,
Time, and that which lies outside, above and beneath, before and
after and all around Time.
So I argued no more.
For me, too, the woman had opened a gate.

MIRANDA STUART.

On Obedience and Rebellion (2)

JOHN WILKINSON

Anglicans are quite ready to agree that obedience is a good thing. When, as children, they learned that their duty to their neighbour was partly to be interpreted as "to submit myself to all my governors, spiritual pastors and masters", it all seemed natural enough. And it is not long, for a good many, before, as young officers, young parents, or young bosses they have learned that obedience is a great virtue indeed—in those to whom they are giving orders.

For those of us who have not yet reached the boss category, the question usually presents itself in a different light. And unless we simply avoid the question, we cannot help noticing that the kind of obedience required of Christians seems to be excessive. A stock answer appears in one of Jeremy Taylor's rules:

> Lift not up thy hand against prince or parent, upon what pretence soever: but bear all personal affronts and inconveniences at their hands, and seek no remedy but by patience and piety, yielding and praying, or absenting thyself.

Or take an instance which appears extreme, and is intended for his monks by Fr. Benson, the founder of the Society of St. John the Evangelist:

> It is in the surrender of the judgment that the chief fruit of obedience is found. It is not obedience if we only do what we agree with . . . (But such obedience) is limited by obedience to Almighty God.

The attitude of Benson and Taylor seems, as one looks at it, to echo much of the teaching of the Bible: but if this is the only kind of thing Christians may say, defiance, challenge, and whatever else it takes to be bright and young, virile and angry, are ruled out. The rebel and all his works bear the mark of Adam and not of Christ.

The trouble is that the Bible, though it says nothing about obedience to Bishops seems to demand from us so much more than the obvious obedience to God. "Honour thy father and thy mother"—then what about Freud? "Servants obey your masters"—then how

about strikes? "Submit yourself to every ordinance of man"—and this not only in custom and tribute, but in fear and honour as well.

Could it be that when it speaks of obedience the Bible is frankly out of date? Certainly its writers, like Taylor, had a paternalist view of society which will not work today without a good deal of renovation. And certainly Israel and seventeenth-century England conceived of Church and State as unified in a way which now seems artificial. But even so, we cannot brush the question aside like that. Whatever the political theory of St. Peter and St. Paul may have been, the rulers whom they told their Christians to obey were in fact Romans, and not Christian Romans either.

It may seem inevitable, then, that to be a proper Christian, one must be also completely submissive to the state, however corrupt it may be. You cannot go to church without adoring the *status quo*. It is a sin to be off beat.

If you think that the *status quo* is the way God has arranged things, then that would provide the motive for trying to pretend that it is perfect. But in fact there is no indication that one has to think that God is directly responsible, for instance for the way the National Health Service tries to look after the mentally sick. And fortunately no one need start from that end of the stick, for the servant of God should not treat the *status quo* as if it is Eden, but recognise that the *status quo* is the place where he first hears God's voice.

God expects men to respond to him in the circumstances in which they find him. But as soon as a man chooses to obey God, his obedience, so to speak, creates its own situation. His surroundings are not merely a hierarchical (and usually phoney) pyramid of authorities, but a system which he must judge by asking whether or not it can form a suitable environment for his response to God's demand.

This does not mean that the *status quo* is given a halo. Instead, a man may realise, perhaps to his surprise, that most of the time there is just no need to rebel. His parents do not, on the whole, want him to do things which are anti-Christian, his employers are seldom actually wicked, and the State in its own interests has to avoid ordering the majority of its subjects to act against their conscience. So long, then, as these authorities tell him to do what is right, reasonable, or neutral, "they watch on behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account".

For those of us who live in England, this view of the Christian in society is usually not too difficult, when we are talking of the

state. The state does concern itself with some things we mind about. But on the whole we don't mind much about economic relations with Guatemala, and if such problems keep us awake at night, it is more often because we wonder why we aren't able to worry about them as Christians than because their urgency is constantly pressing on us.

The bedsock begins to pinch when we think about obedience to the Church. For while most Christians would be prepared to sign a statement that they owe their obedience, perhaps their first obedience to the Church, this is very often a principle of moralising rather than of conduct. What it means in terms of action today, we very often could not say. And we go uneasily to sleep.

Well, why should a Christian obey the Church? The Bible is very reticent about this kind of obedience: and as far as the Church of England is concerned the first time anyone has to make any statement on the subject—after the catechism—is if he happens to be ordained.

At ordination the candidate expresses his views on obedience in no uncertain terms, and assents to the proposition that his obedience is to the local officers of the Church. The Bishop asks him:

> Will you reverently obey your Ordinary and other chief ministers of the Church, and them to whom the government and charge over you is committed, following with a glad heart and mind their godly admonitions?
>
> *Answer:* I will endeavour myself, the Lord being my helper.

And later he swears that he will give "true and canonical obedience in all things lawful and honest" to his diocesan bishop.

This is not so much a development in the demands of the Church, as an increasing clarity in their expression. The catholic Church is the accredited representative of God on earth. As such she obviously demands obedience. Thus the assumption of the Church of England in her formularies is that we obey God in his Church, and that the local manifestation of the Church is the Church of England.

If this were the only assumption, everyone would be prepared to be obedient. But besides her claim to be a true part of the catholic Church, the Church of England is also, on her own admission, a "particular or national Church". If she is limited, she may err: and can I submit to an authority which may err?

But this is the normal state of affairs for the Christian. So long as the bishop has been the local representative of the unity and social

being of the Church, there has also been the recognition that any such localisation brings imperfection. When Ignatius wrote "Do nothing without the Bishop" at the turn of the first century AD, there is no need to suppose that he thought the Bishop would always be right. Thus to be a member of any diocese will involve obedience to a leader who cannot fail to limit his interpretation of the Church's requirements by the exercise of his personality. So obedience for Anglicans today means what it did for English Christians before the Reformation—that we are to obey God in his Church, and that in all the peripheral questions of order, custom and ceremonial, we follow the local church and its local rules. Catholicity of obedience consists not in obedience to an abstraction or a dream, but in my actual obedience here and now to the regulations of that part of the Catholic Church to which I belong.

Three things the Christian will avoid, and very often they are found together, scrupulosity, legalism and escapism.

Scruples are not, perhaps, the besetting danger of most people. But a scrupulous obedience is a very dangerous thing. When Newman was an Anglican, he tended to treat his Bishop as his Pope. As more and more he found that his bishop misunderstood him, he sank deeper and deeper into introspection and disappointment. And it all began because he persisted in offering the Bishop of Oxford powers of command and direction which he neither had nor wanted. The results for the Oxford Movement were disastrous: and the foundations were laid for the Anglo-Catholic attitude which has repeatedly been adopted of lip-service to the office of Bishop and avoidance of the person who holds it. The ordinary Christian wants the bishops to fulfil their proper task in the Christian family, and himself to get on with his own, with their help where it is appropriate. But to hope that Bishops will rule every detail of Christian life is certainly to court disappointment. Perhaps we all need to think out what exactly the Bishops' proper task is.

Legalism is another attempt to by-pass reality. Christian obedience in the Church could well be legalistic, despite the warnings of our Lord. We have rules, perhaps we live by rule. But that is not enough. The reality lies deeper and spreads wider than the petty acts of obedience to rule, canon and rubric. But the reality includes all these, and the sooner Anglicans can make a corporate act of recognition of the fact—for instance in a resolve to treat the new canon law as a

reality—the more likely we are to become an effective Church as well as a free one.

Last and most dangerous of all is escapism. In our dissatisfaction with the powers that be, we may invent for ourselves an authority we are content to obey. This is not the same as the scrupulous obedience which attempts to endow real superiors with imaginary powers: for the escapist creates his own authority *a choix*. So there are some Anglicans who profess their primary obedience to the "Western Church". Whatever this church—which is in fact no more than a highly selective addition of the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches—may command, will outweigh all that a mere local or provincial episcopate may desire to impose. Let us ignore the fact that neither before nor after the Reformation did any such Western Church exercise jurisdiction apart from the local bishops. Let us brush aside the fact that this Western Church does not even exist, while the local bishops only too obviously do. Let us be content to ask what is the principle of selection by which one offers obedience under such circumstances. Do we accept with joy every liturgical decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites? Very well, then why not the decree on Anglican Orders, which comes from an even more venerable source.

The Christian attitude to the *status quo* cannot be merely negative. Part of our troubles come from our inherited aptitude to make Obedience a personified virtue, a detached and irrelevant maiden dancing on some distant greensward. Obedience is when I obey, but I obey people I trust, and if I trust someone, I am more than half-way to loving him. Thus besides accepting the *status quo* in full recognition of its imperfections, besides falling in with the demands of the society which happens to be around him, the Christian must go back into the society, and see what happens to him when he tries to work out his obedience in love. He must be integrated with his society, because Christianity does not work unless Christians have neighbours whom they can love as themselves.

The idea of Christian obedience is thus that it is the means by which our relation with the *status quo* transforms it into a medium for love. It is not that the Christian is ready to obey his employer till the day when he has to revolt. Rather:

> Servants, be obedient unto them that according to the flesh are your masters, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ.

There are some varieties of *status quo* where love can make itse felt. These are the kinds where the Christian can exercise the kir of obedience conceived in the Bible, by Taylor, or by Benso Others make love impossible, and the Christian may have no optic open to him but to leave, and look for a new society and new neig bours. But most societies come in between, and in these the Christian duty must be to obey, to love, and to work by criticism and (lovin refusal of what is definitely wrong.

IAN MICHELL

The only firm of this kind in England, specializing in the sale of second-hand Church furnishings. It was established in 1940 and since then has been much recommended by the Clergy.

The large and varied stock includes most things needed by the Clergy and a detailed list will be gladly sent on request.

Unwanted vestments and the like are always in demand and details of anything you have for sale will be most welcome.

IAN MICHELL
19 LOWER BROOK STREET
IPSWICH · SUFFOLK
Telephone: Ipswich 53467

PRISM PERSONALITY: 6

* * *

DAVID EDWARDS

David Lawrence Edwards is the young brilliant but modest Managing Director and Editor of the Student Christian Movement Press. He is a Fellow of All Souls and the author of *Not Angels but Anglicans* (S.C.M. Press) that provocative—and dare we say Prismatic—account of the Church of England.

* * *

SOME MORE OF OUR CONTRIBUTORS

H. A. L. Rice who is a priest in the Diocese of Lichfield is author of (*inter alia*) *Prayer Book Heritage* (1959).

J. T. A. Gunstone was trained at Mirfield and is a priest in Romford (Chelmsford).

Valerie Pitt is a lecturer responsible for Liberal Studies in a London Regional College of Technology.

Peter Oakley was trained at Queen's College, Birmingham, and is a priest in the St. Alban's Diocese.

J. M. Bickersteth was trained at Wells and is a priest in the Diocese of Southwark.

Roger Tennant was trained at Lincoln and is a priest in Korea.

John Wilkinson is a priest who has worked as a curate in Stepney, has taught at Ely Theological College and is now on the staff of the newly-formed Theological College in Jerusalem. He also spent several months with a Roman Catholic Institute at Louvain.

Richard Taylor

Christians in an Industrial Society

8s 6d net

George Appleton

On the Eightfold Path

Christian Presence Amid Buddhism

12s 6d net

Arthur Michael Ramsey

Introducing the Christian Faith

A new SCM Paperback

3s 6d net

Alan Booth

Christians and Power Politics

A Living Church Book

6s net

Martin Jarrett-Kerr

D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence

7s 6d net

Earl A. Loomis

The Self in Pilgrimage

New Insights in Psychiatry and Religion
A Living Church Book

6s net

SCM PRESS

Printed by Oxley & Son (Windsor) Ltd., 4 High Street, Windsor